

PERSEREC



Technical Report 05-3  
December 2004

## Comparative Productivity of Criminal Record Checks by Federal Investigators and Contractors

Kelly R. Buck

Defense Personnel Security Research Center

Approved for Public Distribution:  
Distribution Unlimited

Research Conducted by  
Defense Personnel Security Research Center



**Comparative Productivity of Criminal Record  
Checks by Federal Investigators and Contractors**

Kelly R. Buck  
Defense Personnel Security Research Center

Released by  
James A. Riedel  
Director

Defense Personnel Security Research Center  
99 Pacific Street, Suite 455-E  
Monterey, CA 93940-2497



REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<p>The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p> <p><b>PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</b></p>					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 01 12 2004		2. REPORT TYPE Technical		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 1/1/2002 - 3/31/2002	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Comparative Productivity of Criminal Record Checks by Federal Investigators and Contractors				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)  Kelly R. Buck				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Defense Personnel Security Research Center 99 Pacific Street, Suite 455-E Monterey, CA 93940-2497				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER  TR 05-3	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Defense Personnel Security Research Center 99 Pacific Street, Suite 455-E Monterey, CA 93940-2497				10. SPONSORING/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSORING/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT <p>This study empirically examined differences in how federal employee and contractor background investigators access criminal records and the rate at which they identify offenders in the course of national security clearance background investigations. Differences were found in strategies employed for conducting record checks across the different states. Federal agents relied more often on statewide checks than contractors. But, when statewide checks were not used, both federal agents and contractors relied more on local law enforcement agencies, following up with court checks only as needed. Overall, federal agents were more likely to surface records in many more states than were contractors. Based on states where enough subjects were investigated to permit analysis, and relative to the proportions of subjects identified with records by federal agents, as of early 2002, contractors may have been missing 15% to 46% of subjects with at least misdemeanor-type arrests, charges, or convictions, depending on whether subjects self-disclosed information on security questionnaires and on the type of investigation (Initial Secret or Confidential, SSBI, or Periodic Reinvestigation).</p>					
15. SUBJECT TERMS National security, SCIA, criminal record, federal investigator, contractor, productivity, state repository, NACLC, law enforcement, personnel security investigation, Defense Security Service, Office of Personnel Management, outsourcing					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES  97	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON James A. Riedel, Director
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 831-657-3000



## **Preface**

This report compares the productivity of criminal record checks conducted by federal employee investigators and contractors for national security purposes. With the transfer of the personnel security investigation function from the DoD Defense Security Service to the Office of Personnel Management, more criminal record checks than ever before will be conducted by contractors. The findings from this study should be useful to decisionmakers in charting the best course for the assignment of this important investigative function.

This report provides data on whether any differences exist between DoD federal agents and contractors. Depending on the interests and needs of decisionmakers in response to this report, a follow-up study will be conducted to provide further analysis and explore reasons for differences. The results of the follow-up study should provide direction as to whether the appropriate response to differences is a matter of articulating clear investigative standards and providing appropriate training, ensuring access authorization to records, and/or preservation of a federal workforce to conduct certain investigative activities for national security purposes.

James A. Riedel  
Director





# Executive Summary

## Introduction

The study examines differences in how federal employee and contractor background investigators access criminal records and the rate at which they identify offenders in the course of national security clearance background investigations. The results of this study have implications for the current and planned use of contractors to conduct criminal record checks for national security purposes.

The criminal record check is a critical component of national security clearance screening. With the planned shift of the personnel security investigation (PSI) function from the Defense Security Service (DSS) to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), the productivity of criminal record checks conducted by private contractors relative to that of federal investigators is receiving heightened attention. The Department of Defense (DoD) contracted 22.4% of investigations in early 2002. In contrast, private contractors are responsible for the majority of OPM's criminal record checks. With the transfer of the PSI function for DoD security clearances to OPM, DoD is confronted with the possibility that the majority of criminal record checks for screening its personnel for national security purposes will be conducted by private contractors.

## Method

To explore differences between productivity of criminal record checks conducted by DoD federal agents and contractors, this study examined reports of the population of over 140,000 federal agent and contractor criminal records checks submitted to DSS between January 1 and March 31, 2002. Using these data, two research questions were addressed: (1) Did contractors and federal government investigators access the same types of agencies and to the same extent and (2) Did contractors and federal employees identify comparable proportions of subjects with at least misdemeanor-type charges, arrests, or conviction records?

## Findings

- **Research Question 1:** Did contractors and federal government investigators typically access the same types of agencies and to the same extent?

Differences were found in strategies employed for conducting record checks across the different states. Federal agents more often than contractors relied on statewide checks. But when statewide checks were not used, both federal agents and contractors relied primarily on law enforcement agencies, following up with court checks only as needed. Two exceptions were Kentucky and West Virginia where federal agents relied to a greater extent than contractors on court record checks.

- **Research Question 2:** Did contractors and federal employees identify comparable proportions of subjects with at least misdemeanor-type charges, arrests, or conviction records?

Federal agents in many states were more likely than contractors to surface criminal records. Out of 32 states analyzed, among Secret, Confidential, SSBI, and PR cases combined where subjects are known to have reported at least one arrest, charge, or conviction reported on their PSQs, federal investigators were more likely than contractors to find information through criminal record checks in 24 states. In four states, contractors had a higher probability of identifying records of subjects who self-reported criminal arrests, charges, or convictions. The five states where both types of investigators found records for comparable numbers of subjects were Illinois, Louisiana, New York, Texas, and the District of Columbia.

Among subjects who do not self-report any arrests, charges, or convictions on their PSQs, federal agents were more likely than contractors to surface information in 34 states compared to only three states where contractors identified more (Oregon, Utah, and Wisconsin). Equivalent rates for the two groups were found in the following 11 states: Alaska, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Nevada, New York, South Dakota, and Tennessee. These findings are tenuous, however, given questions about the comparability of case assignments to federal agents and contractors.

Overall, contractors may be missing citation, arrest, or conviction data for 15% to 46% of subjects with at least misdemeanor-type arrests, charges, or convictions. These percentages vary based on whether subjects self-disclosed information on their PSQs and on type of investigation (Initial Secret or Confidential, SSBI, or Periodic Reinvestigation). They results were derived only from those states with enough cases for analysis.

## **Recommendations**

Based on the findings from this study, the following recommendations are offered:

- DoD, OPM, and other federal agencies covered by SCIA, should conduct additional research, including meeting with appropriate federal employees and contractors conducting investigations, to determine the causes for productivity differences in each state where they are found.
- DoD and OPM should identify and implement cost-effective strategies to minimize the risks of loss of criminal record information that could result from the transfer of more investigations to contractors.

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Method</b>	<b>3</b>
Coding Results of Checks	4
Source of Records	7
State Where Checks Conducted	8
Type of Investigation	9
Number of Subjects with Criminal Records by Type of Investigation	9
Issue Class Classification: Self-Reporting by Subjects	10
Considerations of Sample Bias for Subjects Who Do Not Self Report	11
Analysis	12
<b>Results</b>	<b>14</b>
Extent to Which Federal Agents and Contractors Access the Same Type of Agencies	14
Productivity of Criminal Record Checks Conducted by Federal Agents and Contractors	17
<b>Discussion</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix A: Security Clearance Information Act of 1985</b>	<b>A-1</b>
<b>Appendix B: Obstructions in Obtaining Records</b>	<b>B-1</b>
<b>Appendix C: Number of Record Checks Conducted by State</b>	<b>C-1</b>
<b>Appendix D: State Agencies Checked by Federal Agents and Contractors</b>	<b>D-1</b>
<b>Appendix E: Record Check Strategies by State</b>	<b>E-1</b>
<b>Appendix F: Data Supporting Figures 3 through 5</b>	<b>F-1</b>

## List of Tables

1. Distribution of Criminal Record Checks, by Investigator	4
2. Percentage of Record Checks in Which Some Kind of Information Was Found	6

3. Percentage of the Population of Record Checks with Each Type of Seriousness of Charges, Arrests, or Convictions _____	7
4. Distribution of Criminal Records Checks by Source of Records _____	8
5. Types of Investigations by Type of Investigator _____	9
6. Proportion of Subjects with At Least Misdemeanor-Type Records by Type of Investigation _____	9
7. Proportion of Subjects Reporting Charges, Arrests, or Convictions on their Personnel Security Questionnaires _____	10
8. Proportion of Cases Where Subject Self-Reports Arrests, Charges, or Convictions, by Type of Investigator and Type of Investigation _____	11
9. Distribution of Issue Cases among DSS and Contractors _____	12
10. Percentage of Record Checks Conducted by Each Type of Investigator, by Source of Records _____	14
11. Types of Investigations That Are More Likely to Find At Least Misdemeanor-Type Offenses Through Criminal Record Checks of Subjects Who Self-Report Offense(s) _____	19
12. Types of Investigators That Are More Likely to Find At Least Misdemeanor-Type Offenses Through Criminal Record Checks of Subjects Who Do Not Self-Report Any Offenses _____	21
13. Summary of Effectiveness of Contractors' Criminal Record Checks Relative to Federal Agents' Criminal Record Checks _____	24

### **List of Figures**

1. Example of Reports of Investigation When Criminal Records Are Found _____	5
2. Example of Reports of Investigation When Criminal Records Are Not Found _____	6
3. Proportions of Criminal Record Checks Conducted Through Statewide, LEA, and Court Systems for States Where DSS and At Least One Contractor Conduct a High Proportion of Statewide Checks, by Investigative Agency and State _____	16
4. Proportions of Criminal Record Checks Conducted Through Statewide, LEA, and Court Systems for States Where DSS Conducts a High Proportion of Statewide Checks but Contractors Rely on Local Agency Checks, by Investigative Agency and State _____	16

5. Proportions of Criminal Record Checks Conducted Through Statewide, LEA, and Court Systems for States Where Few or No Investigations by DSS and Contractors Include Statewide Checks	17
--	----



## Introduction

The purpose of this study is to empirically examine differences in how federal employee and contract background investigators access criminal records and the rate at which they identify offenses and offenders during the course of national security clearance background investigations. The results of this study have immediate implications for current and planned expanded use of contractors to conduct criminal record checks for national security purposes.

The criminal record check is a critical component of background screening for national security purposes. Convictions for which individuals have been incarcerated for more than one year and arrests and convictions that provide evidence of drug use by cleared personnel are grounds for denial or revocation of clearances (Smith Amendment, Section 1071, 2001). Arrest records provide indicators of possibly problematic behavior as well as information about addresses, aliases, and associations that subjects may want to hide.

Most states restrict access to criminal records in some way to authorized recipients for authorized purposes. Only five states are open record states without restrictions on access to criminal records. They are Colorado, Florida, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin. Two other states, Iowa and Idaho, provide open access to criminal records with the exception that arrests without dispositions are expunged after 4 years in Iowa, and release of arrests without dispositions after 12 months from the date of arrest requires signed consent of the subject in Idaho. All other states restrict access to arrest, disposition, and/or conviction information to varying extents for different authorized recipients.

Broad access to criminal records for national screening purposes is authorized by the Security Clearance and Information Act of 1985 (SCIA). When federal agents from one of the agencies covered by SCIA<sup>1</sup> conduct criminal record checks for national security purposes, they are authorized to review or receive any arrest, charge, or conviction records unless these records have been expunged or sealed according to policies and procedures that render them inaccessible even to criminal justice agencies for criminal justice purposes (Security Clearance Information Act, 1985). If criminal offense information is available for criminal justice purposes, then it should also be available for authorized purposes by agencies covered by SCIA.

Exceptions to this statement are created when individual state and/or local authorities interpret SCIA differently than was intended. For example, in 2002, police departments in Santa Clara County, CA, turned away federal agents stating they were not authorized to disseminate non-conviction records. They directed the agents to court record systems instead. The New York City Police Department also refused to process requests from non-law enforcement agencies, to include DSS and its contractors, and

---

<sup>1</sup> The Department of Defense (DoD), the Department of State (DOS), The Department of Transportation (DOT), Office of Personnel Management (OPM), the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Full text of SCIA is provided in Appendix A.

instead referred all criminal history checks to the New York State Office of Court Administration. These types of denial of access are relatively rare, however, and most criminal justice agencies provide records as authorized in SCIA to authorized federal agents for national security purposes.<sup>2</sup>

It is not certain, however, whether the same extent of information that is available to federal employees of covered agencies is also made available to individuals who are recognized as contractors working for corporations that conduct investigations for agencies covered by SCIA. Some would say that, according to the spirit of the law, any investigator conducting national security clearance background checks for an authorized agency should be granted the access authorized by SCIA, regardless of whether they are a federal employee or contractor. In reality, and according to the letter of the law, employees of private companies may not be authorized to receive the full access to criminal records specified in SCIA. Instead, they may be subject to state laws that place greater restrictions on dissemination of criminal records for non-criminal justice purposes. Therefore, contractor criminal record checks may be less productive than federal agent record checks

With the planned shift of the personnel security investigation (PSI) function from the Defense Security Service (DSS) to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), the productivity of criminal record checks conducted by private contractors relative to that of federal investigators is receiving heightened attention. The Department of Defense (DoD) contracted out a relatively small percentage of security clearance investigations (22.4%) in early 2002. In contrast, private contractors are responsible for the majority of OPM's criminal record checks. With the transfer of the PSI function for DoD security clearances to OPM, the U.S. government is confronted with the possibility of the majority of criminal record checks for national security purposes being conducted by private contractors.

Anecdotal reports abound of restricted access to criminal records for government contractors working for one of the agencies authorized by SCIA. For example, one investigator who carries a unique credential for each of several agencies for whom he works has observed that he receives different levels of cooperation depending on whether he shows a badge that clearly designates him as "Contract Investigator" versus those badges that do not.

Some are concerned that these restrictions may become more of a problem with the increase in criminal record checks being conducted nationwide due to heightened concerns about national security following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Records custodians are being confronted with a widening array of private investigators conducting background investigations for an increasing number of security-sensitive positions. Whereas before they provided services to a relatively small, known group of trusted individuals employed with federal government agencies, records custodians are now having to deal with many more agencies and different governmental and private

---

<sup>2</sup> Source: Explanations provided in Reports of Investigation for why criminal record checks were not conducted.



investigators. Rather than try to sort out to which of these investigators they can legally disseminate information authorized by SCIA, it is possible that records custodians would err on the side of protecting privacy and limiting liability. As a result, they may opt to grant access consistent with what non-covered criminal justice agencies receive for employment and licensing screening.

Aside from issues pertaining to authorizations for access, the criminal record check system itself is complex. Often, there is not an obviously best way to maximize the probability that any existing record will be found. Each state has a centralized, statewide repository of criminal record information, though the content of these centralized systems varies widely from state to state. Within DSS alone, different field offices employ different search strategies based on the accessibility and confidence in the quality of criminal record information in criminal justice agencies within their jurisdictions. The possibility of search strategy impacting productivity is greater with increasing usage of different contractors. The variance in search strategies employed by DSS and its contractors at present provides an opportunity to begin to identify those practices that are likely to yield the best results.

To explore differences between productivity of criminal record checks conducted by DoD federal agents and contractors, this study examines results of federal agent and contractor reports of investigation submitted between January 1 and March 31, 2002. Using these data, two research questions are addressed: (1) Did contractors and federal government investigators access the same types of agencies and to the same extent, and (2) Were there differences in the rates associated with charge, arrest, or conviction records found through checks performed by contractors compared to federal agents?

This report looks only at the frequency of record requests at different locations and differences in the rates that federal agents and contractors found information in response to those requests. It does not attempt to explain the differences found; it only determines whether there are any differences that need attention. If requested by decisionmakers, a follow-up report will address, as, the causes for any differences found.

The following section describes the method for identifying different sources of criminal records and the results of checks requested from them. Results of analyses of differences between the productivity of federal agents and contractors are then presented. The last section of the report discusses these findings and describes the potential for a follow-up study to explore the possible reasons for differences.

## **Method**

The source of data for this study is the results of local and state criminal record checks provided in reports of investigation (ROIs) submitted by federal and contract investigators to the DSS between 01 January and 31 March 2002. Checks for civil records were removed from the population, as were checks where investigators were obstructed for any reason from requesting records. Obstructions include situations where investigators tried to conduct record checks but were turned away for some reason, and

situations where they did not even attempt a check because they knew that they would be turned away or expected that data would not be found. Obstructions were noted in 1,420 of the federal investigator ROIs and 344 of the contractors' ROIs. Appendix B provides details concerning the kinds of obstructions found for each type of agent. The resulting total number of criminal record checks conducted during this time frame was 140,638. These record checks were conducted for 56,103 subjects.

When ROIs are submitted to DSS, they include a field code that identifies the source of the record. DSS special agents and investigative technicians (hereafter referenced as federal agents) use one of 59 different field codes, depending on their location. Similarly, each contracting agency is assigned one of four distinctive field codes.<sup>3</sup> Cases submitted by these agencies are described collectively in this report as contractors.

Field codes were not available for 97 of the record checks in the database. As shown in Table 1, 77.6% (n=109,108) of the 140,541 record checks with field codes recorded in ROIs were completed by federal agents, whereas 22.4% (n=31,433) were completed by contractors. Table 1 also shows the number of record checks for each contractor within the contractor category.

**Table 1**  
**Distribution of Criminal Record Checks, by Investigator**

<i>Type of Investigator</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Federal Agent	109,108	77.6
Contractor	31,433	22.4
Total	140,541	100.0
<i>Breakout of Contractors' Checks:</i>		
<i>Contractor 1</i>	<i>18,083</i>	<i>12.9</i>
<i>Contractor 2</i>	<i>11,161</i>	<i>7.9</i>
<i>Contractor 3</i>	<i>2,189</i>	<i>1.6</i>

### **Coding Results of Checks**

The reports of criminal record checks were coded either as having some kind of record or no record using logical indicators such as field length and patterns in phrases consistently used by investigators such as "was arrested on," "paid fine of," "dismissed," "plead guilty," "was acquitted," or "was convicted." Special care was taken to ensure that ROIs indicating that known arrests were not found as expected were coded as "no record found."

<sup>3</sup> At the time ROIs for this study were submitted, two contractors were separate companies. Since then, one purchased the other. Despite the fact they were separate entities in early 2002, their results have been combined in this study for two reasons: 1) The contractor as it exists today is likely a combination of the investigative resources that operated separately in 2002; 2) the implications of this study pertain to the unified operations and management of the combined contractor. There would not appear to be any strategic value in presenting the results separately.

When records are located, investigators describe the records' content. The amount of information available to them varies. For example, dispositions of arrests, to include convictions and terms of sentencing, are not always apparent, and the levels of offenses (e.g., infraction, misdemeanor, felony) are not always noted. Nonetheless, it is clear from their reports when investigators have found some kind of information from an agency for a given subject. Typical examples of ROIs that describe records that are found are as follows<sup>4</sup>:

- 
1. A review of the records of the X County Sheriff's Office (LCSO) and the X County Criminal Courts (LCCC), City, State, servicing City and City, State regarding SUBJECT disclosed information pertaining to her Criminal Conduct. CRIMINAL CONDUCT Arrest: LCCC files disclosed that in 19XX, SUBJECT was arrested and charged with dealing in stolen property, a felony offense. This case was filed under LCCC felony division case file # xx-xxx-xx-x-xx. A review of both LCSO and LCCC files failed to locate any arrest/incident report detailing this arrest. Disposition: On X Sep XX, the LCCC remanded the above felony level case down to a misdemeanor, case file # xx-xxxx-xxx-xx, Attachment 1 pertains. Due to the passage of time, the case file was destroyed in 1993 per LCCC policy. Available record information reflected that on X Sep XX, the case was remanded down to a misdemeanor and on X Oct XX, SUBJECT entered into a pre-trial agreement. On xx Oct XX, the case was dismissed in X County Court, Attachment 2 pertains. (13 Feb 02)
  2. Records of the Vallejo, CA Police Department disclosed that on XX April XX, SUBJECT was arrested for Driving While Intoxicated (DWI), a misdemeanor and Speeding. (5 Dec 01)
  3. Records of the Crime Information Center, Georgia Bureau of Investigation, Decatur, GA, servicing all locations in the State of Georgia, revealed SUBJECT was arrested on X Aug XX by the Atlanta Police Department for Affray (fighting). (15 Nov 01)
- 

**Figure 1 Example of Reports of Investigation When Criminal Records Are Found.**

In reports of criminal record checks where no records are found, investigators simply list the agency checked or explicitly mention that no records were found. Typical examples of ROIs where information was not found are listed in Figure 2.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Information that could reveal or enable determination of personally identifying information has been removed to protect the privacy of the subjects.

<sup>5</sup> Personally identifying information about subjects has been removed to protect the privacy of the subjects.

1. Records on file with the Yuma County Justice Court First Precinct (YCJCFP), Yuma, AZ, servicing the City of Yuma, AZ and surrounding area, were reviewed and disclosed no information identifiable with Subject. [1817](11 Feb 02)
2. Pima County Sheriff's Office, Tucson, AZ. (1 Feb 02)
3. Records of the Baltimore City Police Department (BCPD), Baltimore, MD, disclosed no information pertaining to SUBJECT and the listed XX Oct XX charge of Driving While Intoxicated. BCPD files do not contain arrest for Driving While Intoxicated offenses. BCPD files disclosed no additional information. (28 Jan 02)

**Figure 2 Example of Reports of Investigation When Criminal Records Are Not Found.**

As shown in Table 2, some kind of record was found in 14.1% of the 140,638 record checks in the population.

**Table 2**  
**Percentage of Record Checks in Which Some Kind of**  
**Information Was Found**

<i><b>Result of Record Check</b></i>	<i><b>N</b></i>	<i><b>%</b></i>
No records found	120,786	85.9
Records found	19,852	14.1
Total	140,638*	100.0

\*Total includes 97 cases for which field codes were not available

The level of the most serious offenses contained in records that were found was also coded. Thus, if an ROI specifically indicated that a subject was arrested for, charged with, or convicted of a felony, the case was coded as such in the database. Similarly, if the ROI specifically used the word “misdemeanor” in describing a charge, arrest, or conviction, the case was coded accordingly. The only exceptions were misdemeanor vehicle code violations such as driving with license suspended, reckless driving, or driving without insurance, which were simply coded as vehicle code violations. Drinking and driving offenses, however, were included in the misdemeanor offense classification due to their significance as alcohol-related events.

Some offenses that are clearly misdemeanors for which subjects may be arrested in some states are described as summary offenses or infractions in other states. An example is retail theft, which in most cases is a “summary offense” in Pennsylvania, only becoming a misdemeanor on the second offense. In many other states, however, retail theft is a misdemeanor. Public intoxication, marijuana possession, and assault are also charged differently in different states. These types of offenses were included in the misdemeanor offense category (unless they were clearly marked as felonies) regardless of how they were charged in a given state since they are required to be reported on the PSQ and are likely to be of interest to adjudicators.

Of the 19,852 record checks where records were reported to be found, 13,445 or 9.6% of the total population of records listed at least a misdemeanor-type offense and 1,913 or 1.4% clearly listed a felony-related offense. These categories are not mutually exclusive. For example, a case with multiple offenses could be coded within each category.

**Table 3**  
**Percentage of the Population of Record Checks with Each**  
**Type of Seriousness of Charges, Arrests, or Convictions\***

<i>Type of Record</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Felony	1,913	1.4
At Least Misdemeanor*	13,445	9.6
Other citation or vehicle code violation	4,930	3.5

\*One subject can be counted in more than one category if they have multiple arrests

For the remainder of the report, references to cases with “At Least Misdemeanor” offenses also include records where the only offenses found are coded at the felony level. Of the 140,638 cases in the sample, at least a misdemeanor offense or a felony-related offense was found in 15,060 or 10.7% of the population of record checks. This figure does not equal the sum of the number of felonies and the number of misdemeanors shown in Table 3 because a subject with offenses that fall into both categories was coded for analysis as having one “At Least Misdemeanor.”

### **Source of Records**

Record checks were also coded according to the type of agency where they were requested. We identified six main types of agencies:

- **Alternative or Post-Sentencing Involvement:** probation, parole, diversion, alcohol education, etc.
- **Courts:** the term “court” occurring with any of the following types of descriptor: traffic, justice, juvenile, domestic, district, town, municipal, circuit, criminal, county, clerk, magistrate, recorder, state, judicial, probate, family, sessions, combined court, JP, justice of the peace, branch, alderman, trial, chancery, district attorney, and common pleas.<sup>6</sup>
- **DMV:** Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Administrations, or Department of Finance and Revenue.

<sup>6</sup> Some DSS federal agents combine summaries of results of checks of multiple agencies located in one jurisdiction within a single paragraph, so that it references, for example, police, sheriff, and courts. These were coded as court checks, rather than law enforcement agency (LEA) checks, based on the assumption that contractors would have also found the same information through court checks, regardless of whether they found it through LEAs. This errs on the side of caution in favor of the productivity of contractors’ LEA checks by not including some of the LEA checks conducted by federal agents that surface information in federal agents’ productivity totals.

- **Local law enforcement agencies (LEA):** municipal and county arresting agencies, i.e., police and sheriff departments, local departments of public safety, and state agencies organized according to localized jurisdictions (e.g., state police or highway patrol in some states).
- **State repositories:** state's centralized repositories of criminal records, which could include a statewide repository of arrest information and/or court information.
- **Other:** agency checks that potentially surface criminal record information but do not fit in one of the above categories. (e.g., DEA, border patrol).

As shown in Table 4, 49.9% of all criminal record checks are conducted at LEAs. State repositories account for the second most frequent record check with 34.4%. Court records were requested in 13.0% and DMV records were requested in 2.3% of all records checks. Agencies concerned with alternative or post-sentencing involvement and other types of agencies each account for less than 1% of all criminal record checks.

**Table 4**  
**Distribution of Criminal Record Checks by Source of Records**

<i>Type of Agency Checked</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Court	18,304	13.0
DMV	3,255	2.3
LEA (Police or Sheriff)	70,168	49.9
Other	49	0.1
Alternative or Post-Sentencing Involvement	428	0.3
State Repository	48,349	34.4
Not coded	28	0.0
Total	140,581	100.0

### State Where Checks Conducted

The state in which each agency was located where record checks were conducted was coded for each record check in the population. All 50 states and the District of Columbia were represented. The number of checks conducted within each state is presented in Appendix C.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> The listed totals for the state of Alabama are lower than the actual number of checks conducted between January 1 and March 31, 2002. Some of the Alabama checks conducted by contractors were mistakenly extracted to a civil database file due to their reliance on a court database that federal agents did not use. In some early processing of the data, these court checks were defined as "civil" because civil records were found. Records where criminal records were found were included in the database used in the analysis for this report. Most, but not all, of the checks of this court system where records were not found were also included as criminal record checks. Consequently, the Alabama totals are low and biased in favor of the productivity of contractors. If the results of the study had not been clear for the state of Alabama, the researchers would have expended the time and cost to correct the Alabama totals. As it turned out, this was not necessary.

## Type of Investigation

The study also controlled for type of investigation. Of the 56,103 subjects in the population, 64.4% were being investigated for Secret or Confidential clearances (designated as NACLC), 14.7% were Top Secret Periodic Reinvestigations (PR), and 13.5% were for initial Single-Scope Background Investigations (SSBI). As Table 5 shows, federal agents and contractors worked comparable proportions of NACLC investigations, whereas contractors had a higher proportion of PRs (29.8%) than federal agents (11.8%). Federal agents had a higher proportion of SSBI with 15.3% compared to 4.1% for contractors. The type of investigation could not be determined or in a few cases were of a type other than Secret, Confidential, PR, or SSBI for 7.4% of the 56,103 subjects in the population, 98.5% of which (4,080 of 4142) were investigated by federal agents.

**Table 5**  
**Types of Investigations by Type of Investigator**

<i>Type of Investigator</i>	<i>NACLC</i>	<i>PR</i>	<i>SSBI</i>	<i>Other or Unknown</i>	<i>Total # of Record Checks</i>
Federal Agents	64.2	11.8	15.3	8.7	47,100
Contractors	65.4	29.8	4.1	.7	9,003
Total	64.4	14.7	13.5	7.4	56,103

## Number of Subjects with Criminal Records by Type of Investigation

Table 6 shows that the proportion of subjects with at least misdemeanor-type arrests, charges, or convictions was not consistent across the different types of investigations. Secret and Confidential NACLC investigations had the highest rate of subjects with at least misdemeanor-type records with 17.0%. PRs had the lowest proportion of subjects with records at 4.3%. The group of cases where the type of investigation was not defined had the second highest proportion of subjects with at least misdemeanor-type arrests, charges, or convictions with 13.9%. Since 95% of these cases were conducted by federal agents, analyses that control for type of investigation by examining only NACLCs, PRs, and SSBI may be slightly biased against the productivity of federal agents.

**Table 6**  
**Proportion of Subjects with At Least Misdemeanor-Type Records by Type of Investigation**

<i>Type of Investigation</i>	<i>% of Subjects Found With At Least Misdemeanor-Type Records</i>	<i>Total # of Subjects</i>
Type Unknown	13.9	4,143
Secret or Confidential (NACLC)	17.0	36,140
PR	4.3	8,264
SSBI	11.0	7,594
Total	14.1	56,141*

\*Includes 38 investigations where type of investigator could not be determined.

## Issue Case Classification: Self-Reporting by Subjects

Concerns have been raised about the comparability of cases assigned to federal agents and contractors. If one type of investigator was more likely to receive cases where subjects were relatively more likely to have criminal records, and these investigators in fact identified a higher rate of subjects with criminal records, their appearance of greater productivity would simply be an artifact of the original bias in case assignments.

To address concerns about comparability of the types of cases that federal agents and contractors were assigned, cases were coded according to whether subjects answered “yes” to any of the questions pertaining to arrests, charges, or convictions on the Personnel Security Questionnaire (PSQ). As shown in Table 7, of the cases represented in the sample, federal agents had a higher proportion of subjects who self-reported an arrest, charge, or conviction on their PSQs (19.8%) relative to contractors (16.2%). Overall, 18.7% of 56,103 subjects self-reported an arrest, charge, or conviction on their PSQs.

**Table 7**  
**Proportion of Subjects Reporting Charges, Arrests, or Convictions on**  
**their Personnel Security Questionnaires**

<i>Type of Investigator</i>	<i>Self Reports</i> %	<i>No Self Report</i> %	<i>Total # of</i> <i>Subjects</i>
Federal Agent	19.8	80.2	47,100
Contractor	16.2	83.8	9,003
Total	18.7	81.3	56,103

The distribution of cases where subjects self-report arrests, charges, or convictions also depended on the type of investigation. The proportions of subjects who self-reported were comparable in federal agents’ and contractors’ PRs (11.7% and 10.2% respectively). The proportion of federal agents’ Secret and Confidential clearance cases where subjects self-reported arrests, charges, or convictions was somewhat higher (22.2%) than that of contractors’ cases (19.4%) and much higher (19.2% versus 9.6%) among SSBI cases. The proportion of subjects who self-reported charges, arrests, or convictions on the PSQ was also higher in federal agents’ cases (14.3%) than contractors’ cases (11.3%) where the type of investigation could not be determined. These data are presented in Table 8.



**Table 8**  
**Proportion of Cases Where Subject Self-Reports Arrests, Charges, or**  
**Convictions, by Type of Investigator and Type of Investigation**

<i>Type of Investigation</i>	<i>Type of Investigator</i>	<i>Self Reports</i> %	<i>Total # of</i> <i>Subjects</i>
Type Unknown	Federal Agent	14.3	4,080
	Contractor	11.3	62
NACLC	Federal Agent	22.2	30,281
	Contractor	19.4	5,891
Periodic Review	Federal Agent	11.7	5,578
	Contractor	10.2	2,684
SSBI	Federal Agent	19.2	7,211
	Contractor	9.6	366

### **Considerations of Sample Bias for Subjects Who Do Not Self-Report**

Even with controls for self-reporting and case type, issues of sample bias still remain for the group of subjects who did not self-report. The data for this study cannot answer with certainty whether federal agents or contractors received disproportionately higher numbers of subjects who did not self-disclose arrests, charges, or convictions on their PSQs, but who for other reasons, were more likely to be found having criminal records. Two pieces of information were made available, however, to help address the issue: interviews with DSS personnel and analysis of DSS data using Highlander Software.

The author interviewed members of the DSS Personnel Security Investigations Program Office about how cases were assigned. According to DSS personnel, DSS had no written policy for assignment of cases; contractors received all kinds of cases with a few exceptions. Federal agents investigated cases containing overseas work. Federal agents also kept the very small percentage of Top Secret periodic reinvestigations that were identified as being high risk. DSS personnel indicated that the number of these cases would be insufficient to account for the differences between federal agents and contractors found in the study since Top Secret reinvestigations as a whole make up only a small percentage of all investigations, and the proportion of these with misdemeanor-level offenses is very small.

According to DSS, federal agents also kept the “squeaky clean” NACLCs that met criteria for automatic opening. This meant that more issue NACLCs potentially went to the contractor, which should bias the population in favor of contractors identifying more subjects with criminal records.

Finally, according to the DSS personnel who were interviewed, contractors did not receive cases if there were known foreign connections at the time of scoping. If a foreign connection/influence was developed by the contractor or a FINCEN “hit” needed expansion, then the investigation was sent to a DSS federal agent.

DSS data were analyzed using Highlander software to assess the total number of issues found in cases worked by federal agents and contractors, for cases that included a subject interview. Analysis of these data, provided in Table 9, showed that for all cases opened through 2001, the proportion that were “clean,” or did not have issues at the time of opening, was approximately 71% of 267,373 investigations. The proportion of clean cases among those worked by contractors, however, ranged from 56% of 9,178 investigations to 85% of 5,513 investigations, depending on the contractor. Overall, contractors were assigned 26,004 of the 267,373 investigations opened in 2001, of which 32% were designated as issue cases, compared to 28% of 241,369 cases assigned to DSS field offices. This appears to corroborate DSS claims that federal agents were not assigned a disproportionate number of issue cases. It is still not certain, however, whether the cases assigned to DSS field offices had a higher probability of finding criminal records due to the nature of the issue cases they were assigned.

**Table 9**  
**Distributions of Issue Cases among DSS and Contractors**

<i>Type of Investigation</i>	<i>Contractor A (N=5,810)</i>	<i>Contractor B (N=5,513)</i>	<i>Contractor C (N=5,503)</i>	<i>Contractor D (N=9,178)</i>	<i>DSS (N=241,369)</i>	<i>Total (N=267,373)</i>
Added Coverage Investigation	0.2%	0.2%	0.8%	0.3%	0.9%	0.9%
Issue-Related Investigation	15.7%	14.8%	44.8%	43.4%	27.9%	28.3%
Non-Issue Investigation	84.1%	85.0%	54.4%	56.3%	71.1%	70.9%

## Analysis

Differences between federal agents and contractors were assessed through simple cross-classifications of the following variables of interest: whether subjects self-reported, type of investigation, type of investigator, investigative agency, state, and type of agency where checks were conducted, and whether at least misdemeanor-level criminal records were found.

These variables were analyzed both with the record check as the unit of analysis and with the subject as the unit of analysis. The former provides a measure of the proportion of times investigators found information when requested of individual agencies. The latter provides a measure of the proportion of subjects associated with at least misdemeanor-level citations, arrests, charges, or convictions. The proportion of subjects identified is a measure of the effectiveness of an agency’s criminal record check strategy.

Comparisons of rates and odds ratios were used to assess the relative productivity of contractor and federal agent record checks. The rates indicate the proportion of times each type of investigator identified subjects with at least misdemeanor-type records. The

odds ratios indicated how much more or less likely one type of investigator was (relative to the other) to identify subjects with records.

It is important to keep a few things in mind when interpreting differences based on rates and odds ratios. Since the total percentage of subjects who have been arrested, charged, or convicted of at least misdemeanor-type offenses is approximately 10%, a relatively small percentage point difference can translate into relatively high proportions of subjects with records failing to be identified. For example, if Investigator A found records for 20 in 200 (10%) of the subjects he investigated whereas Investigator B found 10 in 200 (5%), the percentage point difference would be 5%, which some may argue is small. The odds ratio gives a sense of the relative *magnitude* of this difference by showing that Investigator A is twice as likely as Investigator B to identify offenders, even though the percentage point difference of offenders found may be 5%. Furthermore, the five percentage point difference for Investigator B equates to them failing to identify 50% of the offending population, if the standard set by Investigator A applies.

Additionally, the likelihood of finding records among subjects who self-report offenses on their PSQs is going to be much higher than the likelihood of finding records among subjects who do not self-report offenses. A two-percentage point difference among subjects who are believed not to have records reflects a greater magnitude of difference between federal agents and contractors than a two-percentage point difference among those who do have records. Finally, in some states, the odds ratios were undefined because one of the types of investigators did not identify any subjects with records out of the subjects they investigated in a given state. For these states, the percentage point differences provide a measure of the relative productivity, however, it should be noted by the reader in those cases that one or the other types of investigator did not find any records.

The research questions that were addressed are as follows:

**Research Question 1:** Do contractors and federal government investigators access the same types of agencies and to the same extent?

- Of the record checks conducted by federal agents and contractors, what proportion were requests of state repositories, local law enforcement agencies, courts, departments of motor vehicle and transportation, or other (corrections, detention, probation, parole, diversion, court-order alcohol education)?
- Where state repositories were used, were federal agents and contractors querying the same agencies?

**Research Question 2:** How productive were the records checks performed by contractors relative to those conducted by federal investigators?

- Out of all the investigations they are assigned, do federal agents and contractors identify comparable proportions of subjects as having at least misdemeanor-type criminal charges, arrests, or convictions?
- Within each state, do federal agents and contractors surface criminal record information at the same rate?

## Results

### Extent to Which Federal Agents and Contractors Access the Same Types of Agencies

As shown in Table 10, federal agents were more than twice as likely as contractors to conduct criminal record checks through state repositories. Of the 109,108 record checks conducted by federal agents, 39.2% (n=42,776) were of state repositories, compared to 17.7% for contractors. Three-fourths (74.8%, n=23,515) of the 31,433 contractor record checks were submitted to local law enforcement agencies compared with 42.7% for federal agents. It is important to remember, however, that if an ROI combined checks of law enforcement agencies and courts within one write-up, the case was coded as a court check rather than a local law enforcement agency check. Therefore, the proportion of checks conducted at LEAs by federal agents is somewhat higher than what is reported in Table 10. Court record checks either constituted 14.6% of all federal agent checks versus 7.4% for contractors. Table 10 also shows that, with only a few exceptions, contractors do not conduct checks of corrections, probation, parole, and diversion agencies and departments of motor vehicle as do federal agents.

**Table 10**  
**Percentage of Record Checks Conducted by Each Type of Investigator, by Source of Records\***

<i>Source of Records</i>	<i>Contractor</i>		<i>Federal</i>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Post Sentencing	5	0.0	423	0.4
Court	2,326	7.4	15,968	14.6
DMV	6	0.0	3,249	3.0
LEA (Police or Sheriff)	23,515	74.8	46,570	42.7
State Repository	5,569	17.7	42,776	39.2
Other	7	0.0	42	0.0
Not Coded	5	0.0	80	0.0
Total	31,433	100.0	109,108	100.0

\*Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding

Appendix D provides the names of state repositories that were found in the database, organized by state and investigative agency. These data support the empirical finding that federal agents access state repositories and DMVs to a greater extent than contractors. The other noteworthy characteristic of the state agencies described in Appendix D is the variance in the names of agencies listed within a state. Federal agents are relatively consistent in recording the names of the agencies checked, whereas individual contractors' labels for agencies often vary from that of federal agents and even other contractors. Agencies names that appear to be derivations on an agency name already listed within a cell are indicated with "AKA" (also known as).

Figures 3 through 5 graphically illustrate the extent to which each agency – whether DSS or one of the three contractors – conduct statewide, LEA, and court checks within each state. States in which both DSS and at least one contractor query state repositories in more than one-half of all criminal record checks are listed in Figure 3. Figure 4 identifies states where DSS conducts most checks through state repositories whereas contractors rely on local criminal justice agencies. Figure 5 indicates states where both DSS and contractors rely primarily on local criminal justice agencies for conducting criminal record checks. Statewide checks constitute less than one-third of all criminal record checks (Wisconsin, New York, Pennsylvania, Mississippi, Nevada) or less than one percent, i.e., all other states in the figure. Numeric data on which these Figures are based are provided in Appendix E.

Solid circles (●) indicate that more than two-thirds of all checks are conducted at a given type of agency. Dark circles with a small white center (◐) represent proportions of 50% to 66%; white circles with small black centers (◑) represent 33% to 49%. Hollow circles (○) indicate less than one-third of the checks are conducted at a given type of agency. Hollow squares (□) represent proportions of less than 1% of all checks conducted. These squares can be interpreted as saying that even though an agency conducts at least some investigations in a given state, they effectively do not rely on the source of records denoted by the square. If a listed agency conducted fewer than 10 checks over all subjects investigated during the 3 months of the study, “n/a” or “not applicable” has been reported.

Figure 3 supports the previously reported finding that federal agents access statewide repositories more often than contractors. With the exception of Hawaii and Virginia, Contractor 3 employees do not regularly, if ever, conduct statewide criminal record checks. Between Contractor 1 and Contractor 2, Contractor 1 more frequently uses statewide checks. Hawaii was the only state where all four agencies in the study conducted the largest proportion of their checks through the state repository.

Figure 4 lists the nine states where federal agents submit the majority of their record checks to state repositories but where contractors conduct less than one-third to none of their checks through state repositories. Contractors in these states relied predominately on law enforcement agency checks, although there does appear to be a higher reliance on court checks in Alaska. It is not known at this time if this is because more offenders were identified through LEAs that were followed up with court checks, or if investigators made a strategic decision to access courts at a greater rate than the other contractors.

<i>Proportion that Were Statewide Checks</i>					<i>Proportion That Were LEA Checks</i>					<i>Proportion That Were Court Checks</i>				
<i>State</i>	<i>DSS</i>	<i>Cntr1</i>	<i>Cntr2</i>	<i>Cntr3</i>		<i>DSS</i>	<i>Cntr1</i>	<i>Cntr2</i>	<i>Cntr3</i>		<i>DSS</i>	<i>Cntr1</i>	<i>Cntr2</i>	<i>Cntr3</i>
AL	●	●	●	□		○	○	○	●		○	○	○	○
CO	●	●	●	○		○	○	○	●		○	○	○	○
CT	○	●	○	○		⊙	○	●	●		○	○	○	□
DE	●	●	●	n/a		○	○	○	n/a		○	○	○	n/a
GA	●	●	⊙	○		○	○	⊙	●		○	○	○	○
HI	●	○	●	●		○	⊙	○	□		○	○	○	○
IL	●	□	●	□		○	●	○	●		○	○	○	○
MA	●	●	●	○		○	○	○	●		○	○	○	○
ME	●	●	⊙	□		○	○	○	●		○	○	○	□
MI	●	○	⊙	○		○	⊙	⊙	●		○	○	○	□
MN	●	●	○	□		○	○	●	●		○	○	○	□
MO	●	□	●	□		○	●	⊙	●		○	○	○	□
NH	●	●	○	○		○	○	●	●		○	○	○	□
NJ	●	●	●	○		○	○	○	●		○	○	○	□
RI	●	●	⊙	□		○	○	⊙	●		○	○	○	□
SC	●	●	●	⊙		○	○	○	⊙		○	○	○	□
UT	●	□	⊙	□		○	●	⊙	●		○	○	○	□
VA	●	○	○	●		○	⊙	●	○		○	○	○	○
VT	●	●	n/a	n/a		○	○	n/a	n/a		○	○	n/a	n/a
WA	○	●	○	○		○	○	●	●		○	○	○	○
WY	●	⊙	⊙	n/a		⊙	○	⊙	n/a		○	○	○	n/a

●=67% or more of all record checks; ⊙=50% to 66% of all record checks ⊙ = 33% to 49% of all record checks  
○=1% to 32% of all record checks; □=less than 1% of all record checks.

**Figure 3 Proportions of Criminal Record Checks Conducted Through Statewide, LEA, and Court Systems for States Where DSS and At Least One Contractor Conduct a High Proportion of Statewide Checks, by Investigative Agency and State.**

<i>Proportion that Were Statewide Checks</i>					<i>Proportion That Were LEA Checks</i>					<i>Proportion That Were Court Checks</i>				
<i>State</i>	<i>DSS</i>	<i>Cntr1</i>	<i>Cntr2</i>	<i>Cntr3</i>		<i>DSS</i>	<i>Cntr1</i>	<i>Cntr2</i>	<i>Cntr3</i>		<i>DSS</i>	<i>Cntr1</i>	<i>Cntr2</i>	<i>Cntr3</i>
AK	●	○	○	n/a		□	⊙	⊙	n/a		○	⊙	⊙	n/a
AR	●	○	○	n/a		○	●	⊙	n/a		○	○	⊙	n/a
AZ	●	□	□	□		○	●	●	●		○	○	○	□
KS	●	□	○	□		○	●	●	●		○	○	○	□
MD	●	⊙	○	□		○	⊙	●	●		○	○	○	○
MT	○	○	○	n/a		⊙	⊙	●	n/a		○	○	○	n/a
NC	●	□	□	□		□	●	⊙	●		○	○	⊙	○
OH	●	□	□	□		○	●	●	●		○	○	○	□
TX	●	□	○	○		○	●	⊙	●		○	○	○	○

●=67% or more of all record checks; ⊙=50% to 66% of all record checks ⊙ = 33% to 49% of all record checks  
○=1% to 32% of all record checks; □=less than 1% of all record checks.

**Figure 4 Proportions of Criminal Record Checks Conducted Through Statewide, LEA, and Court Systems for States Where DSS Conducts a High Proportion of Statewide Checks but Contractors Rely on Local Agency Checks, by Investigative Agency and State.**

Figure 5 shows the states where neither federal agents nor contractors conduct the majority of their record checks through state repositories. With two exceptions, in all of these states, both federal agents and contractors rely primarily on law enforcement agency checks rather than court checks. It is likely that court checks are only requested to follow up law enforcement checks that surface arrest information or when subjects self-report information. The two exceptions are Kentucky and West Virginia where federal agents appear to have implemented a strategy that relies to a greater extent on court record checks.

<i>State</i>	<i>DSS</i>	<i>Cntr1</i>	<i>Cntr2</i>	<i>Cntr3</i>		<i>DSS</i>	<i>Cntr1</i>	<i>Cntr2</i>	<i>Cntr3</i>		<i>DSS</i>	<i>Cntr1</i>	<i>Cntr2</i>	<i>Cntr3</i>
CA	□	□	□	□		●	●	●	●		○	○	○	○
DC	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		●	●	●	●		○	○	○	□
FL	□	□	□	□		●	●	●	●		○	○	○	○
IA	□	□	□	n/a		●	●	●	n/a		○	○	○	n/a
ID	□	□	○	n/a		●	●	●	n/a		○	○	○	n/a
IN	□	□	□	n/a		●	●	●	n/a		○	○	○	n/a
KY	□	□	□	□		○	●	●	●		●	○	○	○
LA	□	□	□	□		●	●	●	●		○	○	○	□
MS	○	□	○	□		●	●	●	●		○	○	○	○
ND	□	□	□	n/a		●	●	●	n/a		○	○	○	n/a
NE	□	□	□	□		●	●	●	●		○	○	○	○
NM	□	□	□	□		●	●	●	●		○	○	○	□
NV	○	□	□	□		○	●	●	●		○	○	○	○
NY	⊙	□	□	□		○	●	●	●		○	○	○	○
OK	□	□	□	□		●	●	●	●		○	○	○	□
OR	□	□	○	n/a		●	●	●	n/a		○	○	○	n/a
PA	○	○	○	○		○	●	●	●		○	○	○	○
SD	□	□	□	n/a		●	●	●	n/a		○	○	○	n/a
TN	□	□	□	n/a		●	●	●	n/a		○	○	○	n/a
WI	⊙	○	○	□		⊙	●	●	●		○	○	○	○
WV	□	□	□	n/a		○	●	●	n/a		●	○	○	n/a

●=67% or more of all record checks; ●=50% to 66% of all record checks ⊙ = 33% to 49% of all record checks; ○=1% to 32% of all record checks; □=less than 1% of all record checks.

**Figure 5 Proportions of Criminal Record Checks Conducted Through Statewide, LEA, and Court Systems for States Where Few or No Investigations by DSS and Contractors Include Statewide Checks.**

### Productivity of Criminal Record Checks Conducted by Federal Agents and Contractors

Analyses of the productivity of criminal record checks were conducted separately for subjects who self-reported offenses and subjects who did not. Table 11 shows for each state whether federal agents or contractors were more likely to identify subjects with at least misdemeanor-level arrests, charges, or convictions in cases where subjects self-reported arrests, charges, or convictions on their PSQs. Table 12 provides the same type of summary but for subjects who do not self-report offenses on their PSQs. In both tables,

the far right column summarizes differences in criminal record check strategies, drawn from Figures 3 through 5 above.

Labels of “Federal” and “Contractor” are used to indicate that for a given state, one type of investigator is at least 1.2 times as likely as the other to identify subjects with criminal records. An odds ratio of 1.2 can be interpreted as saying that one or the other of the groups was 20% more or less likely to identify subjects with records.<sup>8</sup> If the odds ratio of productivity of federal agent record checks to contractor checks is less than 1.2, then the cell is labeled “Equal.”

If either federal agents or contractors investigated fewer than 20 subjects within a state, the respective cell was marked with “n/a” to indicate that there were too few subjects investigated to make a comparison. More cases will have to be added to the population before these states can be assessed. The raw data from which these tables were derived are provided in Appendix F.

The differences in the productivity of the two groups of agents are shown with all investigations combined and broken out by type of investigation. “NACLC” refers to Secret or Confidential clearances. “PR” refers to Top Secret periodic reinvestigations, and “SSBI” refers to single scope background investigation.

In both Tables 11 and 12, states are grouped according to whether contractors or federal agents were more productive, relatively equal, or had too few cases for analysis with all cases combined. Within these groupings, states are ordered alphabetically.

In Table 11, out of the cases where subjects are known to have reported at least one arrest, charge, or conviction on their PSQs, there were 32 states with enough investigations conducted by both federal agents and contractors for analysis. Contractors had a higher probability of identifying subjects who self-reported criminal records in four states. The odds that both types of investigators would find criminal records were equal or closer to equal in four states (Illinois, Louisiana, New York, and Texas) and the District of Columbia. Federal investigators were more likely to find information than contractors through criminal record checks in 24 of the 32 states included in the analysis.

---

<sup>8</sup> The cut point of 1.2 was selected out of a practical need to have some basis for organizing data of the volume and complexity analyzed in this study. Decisionmakers who use these data will need to evaluate what degree of greater or lesser productivity warrants intervention. They may feel that an odds ratio of 1.1 is a sufficient difference for intervention. Or, they may determine that the odds that one type of investigator finds records be greater than 1.2 higher than the other type of investigator before intervention is justified.



**Table 11**  
**Types of Investigators That Are More Likely to Find At Least Misdemeanor-Type Offenses**  
**Through Criminal Record Checks of Subjects Who Self-Report Offense(s)**

<i>State</i>	<i>Type of Investigation</i>				<i>Record Check Strategy</i>
	<i>Any Type</i>	<i>NACLC</i>	<i>PR</i>	<i>SSBI</i>	
MA	Contractor	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
OK	Contractor	Equal	n/a	n/a	Open Record State: All rely on LEAs
OR	Contractor	Contractor	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
WI	Contractor	Contractor	n/a	n/a	Open Record State: Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
DC	Equal	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
IL	Equal	Equal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely more on state repository; 2 contractors use LEAs
LA	Equal	Federal	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
NY	Equal	Equal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
TX	Equal	Equal	Federal	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where 2 of 3 contractors rely more on LEAs
AL	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
AR	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely on statewide checks; contractors conduct statewide checks on less than 1/3 of their subjects
AZ	Federal	Equal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
CA	Federal	Federal	Equal	n/a	All rely on LEAs
CO	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	Open Record State: All rely on state repository except for 1 contractor
FL	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	Open Record State: All rely on LEAs
GA	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
HI	Federal	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
IN	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
KY	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely on district court checks; contractors rely on LEAs
MD	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	Federal agents rely on statewide checks; Contractors conduct statewide checks on less than 1/2, less than 1/3 or none of their subjects
MI	Federal	Equal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents conduct higher proportion of statewide checks; Contractors have lower proportion of statewide checks
MN	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely more on state repository; 2 contractors use LEAs
MO	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely on statewide checks; other 2 contractors rely on LEAs
NC	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state court repository whereas Contractors use LEAs and courts
NJ	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
NM	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
OH	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely on statewide checks; contractors rely on LEAs

<i>State</i>	<i>Type of Investigation</i>				<i>Record Check Strategy</i>
	<i>Any Type</i>	<i>NACLC</i>	<i>PR</i>	<i>SSBI</i>	
PA	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	All rely mostly on LEAs; Federal agents have lowest proportion of LEA checks
SC	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	All rely on State Repository
TN	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
UT	Federal	n/a	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
VA	Federal	Federal	Contractor	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely more on state repository; 2 contractors use LEAs
WA	Federal	Contractor	n/a	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely on statewide checks with contractor conducting higher proportion of statewide checks; other 2 contractors rely on LEAs
AK	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
CT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely on statewide checks; other 2 contractors rely on LEAs
DE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on state repository checks
IA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
ID	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
KS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
ME	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
MS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs; Federal agents and one contractor use statewide checks in a small proportion of cases (less than 1/3)
MT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Federal agents conduct 50 to 66% checks at state repository compared with less than 33% by contractors
ND	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
NE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
NH	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely on statewide checks; other 2 contractors rely on LEAs
NV	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely mostly on LEAs; Federal agents conduct more statewide checks
RI	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Open Record State: All rely on statewide checks
SD	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
VT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
WV	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely more on court checks; contractors rely on LEAs
WY	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely on state repository to greatest extent; contractors to a lesser extent

n/a = fewer than 20 subjects investigated by federal agents and/or contractor

Table 12 shows the differences in productivity of federal agent and contractor criminal record check strategies in investigations where subjects have not self-reported arrests, charges, or convictions on their PSQs. Among cases where subjects do not self-report any records and with all types of investigations combined, federal agents were more likely to surface information than contractors in 34 states. Contractors were more

likely to identify subjects with records in three (Oregon, Utah, and Wisconsin). The odds of federal agents finding records relative to contractors was less than 1.2 in the remaining 11 states that had sufficient numbers of investigations for analysis.

Among subjects who did not self-report at least one offense on their PSQ, the rate at which records were found by federal agents and contractors were equivalent in the following 11 states: Alaska, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Nevada, and New York, South Dakota, and Tennessee

The need to control for type of investigation is greater among the population of subjects who did not self-report offenses than among those who did. The reason is that there is a higher probability of offense records among the initial secret and confidential security clearance investigations than there is among the PRs and possibly the SSBI.

Within the NACLC category of Table 12, contractors had a higher rate of identifying subjects with at least misdemeanor-type records in six states, compared with three states over all investigations combined. For federal agents, a higher proportion of subjects in Secret and Confidential NACLC investigations were identified in 32 states, compared to 34 states with all types of investigation combined.

**Table 12**  
**Types of Investigators That Are More Likely to Find At Least Misdemeanor-Type Offenses Through Criminal Record Checks of Subjects Who Do Not Self-Report Any Offenses**

<i>State</i>	<i>Type of Investigation</i>				<i>Record Check Strategy</i>
	<i>Any Type</i>	<i>NACLC</i>	<i>PR</i>	<i>SSBI</i>	
OR	Contractor	Contractor	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
UT	Contractor	Contractor	Contractor	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
WI	Contractor	Contractor	n/a	n/a	Open Record State: Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
AK	Equal	Contractor	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
IA	Equal	Equal	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
KS	Equal	Contractor	Equal	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
LA	Equal	Equal	Federal	n/a	All rely on LEAs
NH	Equal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely on statewide checks; other 2 contractors rely on LEAs
NM	Equal	Federal	Contractor	n/a	All rely on LEAs
NV	Equal	Federal	n/a	n/a	All rely mostly on LEAs; Federal agents conduct more statewide checks
NY	Equal	Equal	Federal	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
SD	Equal	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
TN	Equal	Contractor	Equal	n/a	All rely on LEAs

<i>State</i>	<i>Type of Investigation</i>				<i>Record Check Strategy</i>
	<i>Any Type</i>	<i>NACLC</i>	<i>PR</i>	<i>SSBI</i>	
WA	Equal	Federal	Contractor	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely on statewide checks with contractor conducting higher proportion of statewide checks; other 2 contractors rely on LEAs
AL	Federal	Federal	Contractor	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
AR	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely on statewide checks; contractors conducts statewide checks on less than 1/3 of their subjects
AZ	Federal	Equal	Federal	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where contractors rely more on LEAs
CA	Federal	Equal	Federal	Federal	All rely on LEAs
CO	Federal	Federal	Contractor	n/a	Open Record State: All rely on state repository checks except for 1 contractor (smallest)
CT	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely on statewide checks; other 2 contractors rely on LEAs
DC	Federal	Federal	Federal	Equal	All rely on LEAs
DE	Federal	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on state repository checks
FL	Federal	Federal	Federal	Contractor	Open Record State: All rely on LEAs
GA	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
HI	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
ID	Federal	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
IL	Federal	Federal	Contractor	Federal	Federal agents and one contractor rely more on state repository checks; 2 contractors use LEAs
IN	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	All rely on LEAs
KY	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	Federal agents rely on district court checks; contractors rely on LEAs
MA	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
MD	Federal	Federal	Federal	Contractor	Federal agents rely on statewide checks; Contractors conduct statewide checks on less than 1/2, less than 1/3 or none of their subjects
MI	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents conduct higher proportion of statewide checks; Contractors have lower proportion of statewide checks
MN	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely more on state repository checks; 2 contractors use LEAs
MO	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	Federal agents and one contractor rely on statewide checks; other 2 contractors rely on LEAs
MS	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	All rely on LEAs; Federal agents and one contractor use statewide checks in a small proportion of cases (less than 1/3)
NC	Federal	Federal	Contractor	n/a	Federal agents rely more on state court repository whereas Contractors Use LEAs and courts
ND	Federal	n/a	Equal	n/a	All rely on LEAs
NE	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	All rely on LEAs
NJ	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
OH	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	Federal agents rely on statewide checks; contractors rely on LEAs
OK	Federal	Federal	Equal	n/a	Open Record State: All rely on LEAs

<i>State</i>	<i>Type of Investigation</i>				<i>Record Check Strategy</i>
	<i>Any Type</i>	<i>NACLC</i>	<i>PR</i>	<i>SSBI</i>	
PA	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	All rely mostly on LEAs; Federal agents have lowest proportion of LEA checks
RI	Federal	Federal	Equal	n/a	Open Record State: All rely on statewide checks
SC	Federal	Federal	Federal	n/a	All rely on state repository checks
TX	Federal	Federal	Federal	Federal	Federal agents rely more on state repository checks where 2 of 3 contractors rely more on LEAs
VA	Federal	Federal	Federal	Federal	Federal agents and one contractor rely more on state repository checks; 2 contractors use LEAs
WV	Federal	Federal	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely more on court checks; contractors rely on LEAs
WY	Federal	n/a	n/a	n/a	Federal agents rely on state repository to greatest extent; contractors to a lesser extent
ME	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on statewide checks
MT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Federal agents conduct 50 to 66% checks at state repository compared with less than 33% by contractors
VT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	All rely on statewide checks

n/a = fewer than 20 subjects investigated by federal agents and/or contractor

Table 13 provides summary statistics for the relative productivity of contractor and federal agent criminal record checks. The overall percentage differences in the rates at which federal agents and contractors found at least misdemeanor-type arrest, charge, or conviction information through criminal record checks range from .6 to 2.8 percent when subjects did not self-report offense information on their PSQs. The percentage difference ranges from 7.3 to 8.5 percent when subjects did self-report offense information. In both conditions, federal agents identified higher proportion of subjects than contractors.

As mentioned earlier, since the total percentage of subjects who have been arrested, charged, or convicted of at least misdemeanor-type offenses is approximately 10%, a small percentage difference can translate into relatively high proportions of subjects with records failing to be identified. This can be seen in the odds ratios that indicate federal agents are sometimes twice as likely as contractors to identify subjects with criminal records.

The significance of the percentage difference in productivity can also be seen in the last row of Table 13, which applies the overall percentage difference between federal agents and contractors to the subjects in the contractor population who, based on self-reports and criminal records checks, would not be known to have misdemeanor-type arrests, charges, or convictions. For example, over all investigations combined, among subjects who did self-report offense information on the PSQ, the percentage difference in the proportions of subjects identified between federal agents and contractors was 8.5% in favor of federal agents. Among contract investigations, 627 of the 2,214 subjects were found to have at least one misdemeanor-type record, with 1,587 subjects having evidence of a criminal citation, arrest, or conviction. Applying the 8.5 percentage differential to this population of 1,587 subjects indicates that potentially 135 subjects with at least misdemeanor type records were not identified as such by contractors. These 135 subjects represent 17.7% of the total population of subjects with at least misdemeanor type

records assigned for investigation by contractors [135 divided by (135 missed + 627 identified)].

Among Secret and Confidential clearance subjects who self-reported at least one offense on their PSQs, contractors missed records for 14.6%; among PR investigations they missed potentially 27.8%. Among Secret and Confidential clearance subjects who do not self-report offenses, contractors failed to identify 30.8% whereas among PR investigations, they missed 38.7%. Over all investigations combined, contract investigators missed 45.8% of subjects who had at least misdemeanor-type arrests, charges, or convictions but who do not self-report any offenses on their PSQs.

**Table 13**  
**Summary of Effectiveness of Contractors' Criminal Record Checks Relative to Federal Agents' Criminal Record Checks**

<i>Type of Investigation</i>	<i>Subject Self-Reports At Least One Offense on PSQ</i>			<i>Subject Does Not Self-Report Any Offenses on the PSQ</i>		
	<i>All Investigations Combined</i>			<i>All Investigations Combined</i>		
	<i>Combined</i>	<i>NACLC</i>	<i>PR</i>	<i>Combined</i>	<i>NACLC</i>	<i>PR</i>
Total # subjects contractors found to have records	627	509	39	390	324	38
Total # subjects federal agents found to have records	3,761	3,024	96	2,436	2,035	84
Total # of subjects investigated by contractors	2,214	1,602	248	12,179	7,217	4,041
Total # of subjects investigated by federal agents	10,226	7,603	416	44,066	30,873	5,568
Percentage point difference in total number of subjects with criminal records identified by federal agents relative to that of contractors, out of all subjects investigated	8.5%	8.0%	7.3%	2.8%	2.1%	.6%
Odds ratio if conducted by federal agent rather than Contractor	1.75	1.73	2.75	2.00*	2.02	Not def.
# of Offenders in "Clean" Population that would be missed by Contractors, based on proportions identified by federal agents (percentage point difference times subjects not found to have records)	135	87	15	330	145	24
% of total number of offenders in population potentially missed by contractors (value in previous row divided by this value plus number of subjects found with records)	17.7%	14.6%	27.8%	45.8%	30.8%	38.7%

\* Excludes 8 states where odds ratio undefined because contractors found 0 subjects with records.

## Discussion

This study examined differences in productivity and strategies for conducting criminal record checks conducted by federal agents and private contractors for national security purposes. Differences were found in strategies employed for conducting record checks across the different states. Federal agents relied more often on statewide checks than contractors. But, when statewide checks were not used, both federal agents and contractors relied primarily on law enforcement agencies, following up with court checks only as needed. Two exceptions were Kentucky and West Virginia where federal agents relied to a greater extent on court record checks than contractors.

Significant differences in the productivity of federal agent and contractor checks were found in some states, whereas in others there were no differences. Overall, federal agents were more likely to surface criminal records in many more states than were contractors. And overall, in states where enough subjects were investigated to permit analysis, based on the proportions of subjects identified with records by federal agents, contractors appear to have been missing 15% to 46% of subjects with at least misdemeanor-type arrests, charges, or convictions, depending on whether subjects self-disclosed information on their PSQs and on the type of investigation.

The obvious question is what accounts for the differences found between federal agents and contractors. One reason may be that differences in search strategies account for differences in the likelihood that federal agents or contractors find more records. For example, contractors were more likely than federal agents to identify offenders in the state of Wisconsin. In Wisconsin, federal agents conducted a higher proportion of record checks using the state repository than did contractors, so perhaps the cause of the differences in productivity had to do with the type of offense information in the Wisconsin state repository. In Alabama, federal agents were much more likely than contractors to identify subjects with records. In this state, contractors relied primarily on a statewide court record system whereas federal agents had access to conviction and non-conviction records through the Alabama Criminal Justice Information Center. In Maryland, federal agents, who relied on statewide checks through the state criminal history repository, identified a higher proportion of offenders than did contractors, who relied primarily on local criminal justice agency checks.

In states where federal agents and contractors employ comparable criminal record search strategies, differences in authorizations to access non-conviction, non-disposition, juvenile, and sealed criminal record information may explain similarities and differences in the likelihood that one or the other identifies more subjects with criminal arrests, charges, or convictions. For example, in the state of Georgia, both federal agents and contractors indicated they conduct the majority of record checks through the state Crime Information Center (GCIC), yet federal agents were more likely to identify subjects who had criminal arrests, charges, or convictions in that state. Research is needed to determine whether Georgia state law grants federal agents and contractors the same degree of access to information stored in the GCIC.

If needed by decisionmakers, a follow-up study could be conducted that examines the possible reasons for productivity differences by taking a closer look at the details of the actual agencies being queried, the information that is being found, and differences in state laws that may be impacting record accessibility. Further attention could also be given to the comparability of case assignments where subjects do not self-report criminal arrests, charges, or convictions to ensure that biases in types of cases worked by federal agents and contractors do not contribute to differences in measures of productivity. The goal of that effort could be to provide clearer direction to policymakers and investigators regarding the best set of criminal record screening practices for national security purposes.

## **Recommendations**

Based on the findings from this study, the following recommendations are offered:

- PERSEREC, in alliance with DSS, OPM, and other covered federal agencies, should conduct additional research including meeting with both federal employees and contractors to determine causes for productivity differences in each state where they are found.
- DoD and OPM should identify and implement cost-effective strategies to minimize the loss of criminal record information that could result from the transfer of more investigations from federal employees to contractors.



## References

- Buck, K.R., & Reed, F.M. (2002). *Reliability of centralized criminal record repository checks in lieu of local criminal justice agency checks in four U.S. states: California, Florida, Pennsylvania, and Indiana*. (Tech. Report 03-1). Monterey, CA: Defense Personnel Security Research Center.
- Security Clearance Information Act of 1985, 5 U.S.C. § 9101 (1985).
- Smith Amendment, Section 1071 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, amending Title 10 U.S.C. § 986.



## **Appendix A**

### **Security Clearance Information Act of 1985**



United States Code  
TITLE 5 - GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND EMPLOYEES  
PART III - EMPLOYEES  
SUBPART H - ACCESS TO CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD INFORMATION  
CHAPTER 91 - ACCESS TO CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS FOR NATIONAL  
SECURITY AND OTHER PURPOSES

**Section 9101. Access to criminal history records for national security and other purposes**

(a) As used in this section:

(1) The term "criminal justice agency" means (A) any Federal, State, or local court, and (B) any Federal, State, or local agency, or any subunit thereof, which performs the administration of criminal justice pursuant to a statute or Executive order, and which allocates a substantial part of its annual budget to the administration of criminal justice.

(2) The term "criminal history record information" means information collected by criminal justice agencies on individuals consisting of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, indictments, informations, or other formal criminal charges, and any disposition arising therefrom, sentencing, correction supervision, and release. The term does not include identification information such as fingerprint records to the extent that such information does not indicate involvement of the individual in the criminal justice system. The term does not include those records of a State or locality sealed pursuant to law from access by State and local criminal justice agencies of that State or locality.

(3) The term "classified information" means information or material designated pursuant to the provisions of a statute or Executive order as requiring protection against unauthorized disclosure for reasons of national security.

(4) The term "State" means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(5) The term "local" and "locality" means any local government authority or agency or component thereof within a State having jurisdiction over matters at a county, municipal, or other local government level.

(6) The term "covered agency" means any of the following:

- (A) The Department of Defense.
- (B) The Department of State.
- (C) The Department of Transportation.
- (D) The Office of Personnel Management.
- (E) The Central Intelligence Agency.
- (F) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b)(1) Upon request by the head of a covered agency, criminal justice agencies shall make available criminal history record information regarding individuals under investigation by that covered agency for the purpose of determining eligibility for any of the following:

- (A) Access to classified information.

- (B) Assignment to or retention in sensitive national security duties.
- (C) Acceptance or retention in the armed forces.
- (D) Appointment, retention, or assignment to a position of public trust or a critical or sensitive position while either employed by the Government or performing a Government contract.

(2) Such a request to a State central criminal history record repository shall be accompanied by the fingerprints of the individual who is the subject of the request if required by State law and if the repository uses the fingerprints in an automated fingerprint identification system.

(3) Fees, if any, charged for providing criminal history record information pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed the reasonable cost of providing such information.

(4) This subsection shall apply notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation of any State or of any locality within a State, or any other law of the United States.

(c) A covered agency shall not obtain criminal history record information pursuant to this section unless it has received written consent from the individual under investigation for the release of such information for the purposes set forth in paragraph (b)(1).

(d) Criminal history record information received under this section shall be disclosed or used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (b)(1) or for national security or criminal justice purposes authorized by law, and such information shall be made available to the individual who is the subject of such information upon request.

(e)(1) Automated information delivery systems shall be used to provide criminal history record information to a covered agency under subsection (b) whenever available.

(2) Fees, if any, charged for automated access through such systems may not exceed the reasonable cost of providing such access.

(3) The criminal justice agency providing the criminal history record information through such systems may not limit disclosure on the basis that the repository is accessed from outside the State.

(4) Information provided through such systems shall be the full and complete criminal history record.

(5) Criminal justice agencies shall accept and respond to requests for criminal history record information through such systems with printed or photocopied records when requested.

(f) The authority provided under this section with respect to the Department of State may be exercised only so long as the Department of State continues to extend to its employees and applicants for employment, at a minimum, those procedural safeguards provided for as part of the security clearance process that were made available, as of May 1, 1987, pursuant to section 163.4 of volume 3 of the Foreign Affairs Manual.

**Appendix B**

**Obstructions in Obtaining Records**





<i><b>Obstructions</b></i>	<i><b>Contract</b></i>	<i><b>DSS</b></i>
Non-conviction information is not provided to investigators.	0	489
Agency will not provide records to non-criminal justice investigators.	253	0
Records were intentionally destroyed by the record-holding agency	10	199
Agency takes an unreasonable amount of time to complete record checks.	3	166
Juvenile records are not accessible.	9	129
A signed consent form is required for the release of subject's records.	16	71
Records are not available at the moment.	0	56
Records are not maintained after a certain period of time.	2	40
Agency will not perform record checks.	9	35
Agency's policy prohibits the release of certain types of records.	5	32
Records were unintentionally destroyed.	0	31
Records have been expunged.	4	27
No reason provided for unsuccessful record check or reason unclear.	2	37
Records are located in a storage facility.	2	22
Computer problems	9	21
Records can only be obtained by a request from DSS headquarters.	0	14
Agency denies access to contract investigators.	13	0
LAC was to be conducted by an official in the local police department.	0	12
Agency charges a fee for record checks.	0	10
Agency did not respond to the request for records.	0	9
Court case is still pending.	1	8
Record checks require a fingerprint card.	6	1
Records can only be obtained through DCII	0	4
Records were not checked because no new information would emerge.	0	4
Agency does not accept record requests from field offices.	0	2
File size made retrieval too cumbersome.	0	1
Total	344	1,420



## **Appendix C**

### **Number of Record Checks Conducted by State**



<i>State</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Not Coded	2	0.0
AK	376	0.3
AL	2,546	1.8
AR	1,033	0.7
AZ	3,352	2.4
CA	21,485	15.3
CO	2,108	1.5
CT	2,196	1.6
DC	3,037	2.2
DE	486	0.3
FL	6,498	4.6
GA	3,051	2.2
GU	10	0.0
HI	1,776	1.3
IA	1,981	1.4
ID	627	0.4
IL	2,485	1.8
IN	1,986	1.4
KS	1,261	0.9
KY	1,410	1.0
LA	3,153	2.2
MA	2,476	1.8
MD	6,566	4.7
ME	652	0.5
MI	1,336	1.0
MN	864	0.6
MO	2,286	1.6
MS	1,429	1.0

\* Unknown

<i>State</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
MT	326	0.2
NC	2,662	1.9
ND	836	0.6
NE	1,450	1.0
NH	1,194	0.8
NJ	3,507	2.5
NM	2,163	1.5
NV	882	0.6
NY	5,278	3.8
OH	2,613	1.9
OK	2,976	2.1
OR	1,186	0.8
PA	6,684	4.8
PR	278	0.2
RI	610	0.4
SC	1,361	1.0
SD	395	0.3
TN	1,942	1.4
TX	8,156	5.8
UK*	176	0.1
UT	1,038	0.7
VA	12,898	9.2
VI	45	0.0
VT	225	0.2
WA	2,463	1.8
WI	1,254	0.9
WV	1,110	0.8
WY	381	0.3
Total	140,557	100.0



## **Appendix D**

### **State Agencies Checked by Federal Agents and Contractors**





State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
AK	Alaska Public Safety Information Network (APSIN), Department of Public Safety, Anchorage Alaska, a repository for all state and local criminal history information in Alaska reviewed via the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS)	Alaska State Police, Criminal Justice Information System, Juneau, AK, servicing all locations in the State of Alaska (n=3)	State of Alaska, Alaska Court System, Anchorage, AK, a centralized statewide-automated court records system	
AL	<p>Alabama Criminal Justice Information Center (ACJIC), Montgomery, AL, repository for all felony and misdemeanor arrests for the State of Alabama</p> <p>Alabama Judiciary Inquiry Database System located at the District Court, Montgomery County Courthouse, Montgomery, AL, servicing all law enforcement agencies and courts in the state of Alabama.</p> <p>AKA Alabama Judicial Data Center database at the Montgomery County Courthouse in Montgomery, AL Alabama State Judicial Information (SJIS), Mobile, AL. SJIS is the Central Repository of Law Enforcement records in the State of Alabama</p>	<p>Alabama State Judicial Information System, Montgomery, AL, servicing all locations in the State of Alabama</p> <p>AKA Alabama State Judiciary Division, Montgomery, AL AKA Alabama State Judiciary Information System, Montgomery, AL</p>	<p>Alabama State Judicial Information (SJIS), Mobile, AL. SJIS is the Central Repository of Law Enforcement records in the State of Alabama</p> <p>Alabama Court Records, Mobile, AL, a statewide database serving all of Alabama</p> <p>State wide Alabama Department Of Public Safety, covering the entire state of Alabama</p> <p>Alabama Bureau of Investigation, Montgomery, AL, covers entire state of AL.</p>	
AR	<p>Arkansas Crime Information Center (ACIC), Little Rock, AR, the computerized central history record repository for felonies and misdemeanors for the State of Arkansas.</p> <p>Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration, Driver Control, Division (ADFADC), as revealed through ACIC.</p>	Arkansas State Police Identification Bureau, Little Rock, AR, servicing all locations in the State of Arkansas	<p>Arkansas State Police, Bureau of Identification, Little Rock, AR, covers the entire state.</p> <p>AKA: Arkansas State Police, Little Rock, AR. Arkansas State Police is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the state of Arkansas</p>	

State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
AZ	Arizona Criminal Justice Information System (ACJIS), maintained by the Arizona Department of Public Safety (ADPS), Phoenix, AZ, servicing the state of Arizona			
CA	California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), Sacramento, CA			
CO	Colorado Crime Information Center (CCIC), a computerized criminal history record information system for all Colorado law enforcement agencies	Colorado Bureau of Investigation, Denver, CA, servicing all locations in the State of Colorado	Colorado Bureau of Investigations, Denver, CO. Colorado Bureau of Investigations is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the state of CO	Colorado Bureau of Investigation, Crime Information Center, serving the entire state of Colorado AKA Colorado State Police serving all jurisdictions within the State of Colorado AKA Colorado Statewide Online Police check, serving as a repository for all criminal records in the State of Colorado AKA Colorado Statewide Police

State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
CT	<p>State of Connecticut, Bureau of Identification, Connecticut State Police, (CSP), Middletown, CT, a central record repository servicing all towns and communities in the State of Connecticut. Under CT General Statutes 54-90, and amendments thereto, if a person in the State of CT is found not guilty in a criminal proceeding or the charges against him are dismissed, the records are automatically legally erased, ab initio, as of the date of the dismissal, if the charges are Nolle, the records are automatically legally erased, ab initio, 13 Months from the Nolle, and local law enforcement agencies as well as the appropriate courts/probation departments are prohibited from releasing any information on such cases.</p> <p>Central Infractions Bureau, State of Connecticut, Wethersfield, CT, a central records repository for traffic and non- traffic summary infractions, servicing all towns and communities in the state of CT. [0369] (9 Jan 02)</p> <p>Department of Motor Vehicles, State of Connecticut, Wehthersfield, CT</p>	<p>Connecticut Department of Public Safety, State Bureau of Identification, Middleton, CT, servicing all locations in the State of Connecticut. [C2180] (4 Mar 02)</p>	<p>Connecticut State Police Bureau of Identification, Middletown, CT, CT State Police Bureau of Identification is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of CT.</p>	<p>Connecticut State Police</p>

State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
DE	<p>State Bureau of Identification (SBI), Headquarters, Delaware State Police (DSP), Dover, DE, servicing the entire State of Delaware. SBI is the state repository for Criminal History Records Information (CHRI) developed and maintained in the State of Delaware. Existing Delaware law requires that all state law enforcement agencies contribute CHRI to SBI, and all inquiries for the purpose of retrieving CHRI must be initiated through SBI.</p> <p>Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV), State of Delaware, Dover, DE, servicing the entire State of Delaware. (Records reviewed only contain conviction details for the most recent five-year period.)</p> <p>Revocation Section, Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV), State Of Delaware, Dover, DE, servicing the entire state of Delaware</p>	Delaware State Police, Bureau of Identification, Dover, DE, servicing all locations in the State of Delaware	Delaware State Police. The state police maintain a database, which contains information on all arrests in the state of Delaware.	
FL	Division of Driver's Licenses, Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, State of Florida, through a computer terminal at WCC	Florida Department of Law Enforcement servicing all locations in the State of Florida (N=4)	Florida Department of Law Enforcement, Tallahassee, FL, covers state of Florida	
GA	<p>Georgia Crime Information Center (GCIC), Atlanta, GA, statewide repository for all felony and serious misdemeanor arrest information, servicing all law enforcement agencies in the state of Georgia</p> <p>Georgia Department of Public Safety (GDPS), Atlanta, GA, a statewide repository for traffic related incidents maintained by the GCIC, Atlanta, GA</p>	Georgia Bureau of Investigation, Crime Information Center, Decatur, GA, servicing all locations in the State of Georgia	<p>Georgia State Bureau of Investigation, covering the entire State of Georgia AKA Crime Information Center, GA Bureau of Investigation, Decatur, GA, the central agency in the state that receives copies of all arrest records made by law enforcement authorities</p> <p>Chamblee Police Department, Chamblee, GA. Chamblee Police Department is a Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of Georgia</p>	Georgia State Police serving all jurisdictions within the State of Georgia

State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
HI	Hawaii Criminal Justice Data Center, Honolulu, HI, servicing the Police Departments and Courts on the Islands of Hawaii, Kauai, Lanai, Maui, Molokai and Oahu AKA Hawaii Bureau of Crime Statistics and Identification, Honolulu, HI, servicing the Islands of Hawaii, Kauai, Lanai, Maui, Molokai and Oahu	Hawaii Criminal Justice Center, Honolulu, HI, servicing all locations in the State of Hawaii	HI Criminal Justice Data Center, Honolulu, HI, HI Criminal Justice Data Center is a Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of HI AKA State of Hawaii, Attorney General's Office, Hawaii Criminal Justice Data Center, Honolulu, accesses misdemeanor and felony conviction records for entire state	Hawaii Criminal Data Center
ID			Idaho State Police Criminal Identification Bureau, serving statewide	
IL	Illinois Law Enforcement Agencies Data System (LEADS), which maintains arrest records for all police departments in Illinois  National Law Enforcement Telecommunication Enforcement System (NLETS), which maintains arrests records for police departments in various states was conducted for the State of Illinois and disclosed no criminal record pertaining to Subject in the State of Illinois.		Illinois State Police Bureau of Identification, Joliet, IL, which is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of Illinois AKA Illinois State Police, Bureau of Identification, Joliet, IL, covers entire state  SW Illinois State Police Bureau of Identification, covering the entire state of IL	
IN	Indiana State Police, Headquarters, Indianapolis, IN.			
IN	Iowa Department of Transportation (IDOT), Des Moines, IA			
KS	Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI), Topeka, KS which maintains arrest records for all police departments and sheriff offices throughout the state of Kansas	Kansas Bureau of Identification, Topeka, KS	Criminal Justice Records Division, covering the entire state of Kansas.	
LA	Louisiana State Police, Baton Rouge, LA, servicing the State of Louisiana.			

State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
MA	<p>Massachusetts Criminal History Systems Board, Boston, Massachusetts, the central repository for all criminal records and court appearances in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.</p> <p>VS</p> <p>Criminal History Systems Board, Boston, MA, the central repository for all criminal court appearances in the Commonwealth of MA</p>	<p>Criminal History Systems Board, Chelsea, MA, servicing all locations in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts</p>	<p>Criminal History Systems Board, Chelsea, MA, Criminal History Systems Board is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of MA</p> <p>Criminal Offender Record Information (CORI), Criminal History Systems Board, Chelsea, MA, covers the entire state of Massachusetts</p>	<p>Commonwealth of Massachusetts Criminal History Systems Board serving as a repository for the entire state of Massachusetts</p> <p>CORI Unit, Commonwealth of Massachusetts</p> <p>Massachusetts Statewide Police</p> <p>Massachusetts State Police, serving all jurisdictions in the State of Massachusetts</p> <p>Massachusetts State Police, serving the State of Massachusetts</p> <p>Massachusetts Statewide Criminal History, serving the entire State of Massachusetts</p>
MD	<p>Maryland State Police, Maryland Inter-Agency Law Enforcement, Pikesville, MD, servicing all locations in the State of Maryland</p>			
MD	<p>Data Center Computer Records of the Maryland Inter-Agency Law Enforcement System (MILES), Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Pikesville, MD 21208,</p> <p>(a) Maryland State Police (MSP), Central Repository for Criminal Records (CRCR), Pikesville, MD, containing criminal arrest history information within the State of Maryland</p> <p>(b) Maryland RAP Sheet (RAPS), containing State of Maryland District and Circuit Court criminal information</p> <p>(c) Maryland Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA), Glen Burnie, MD</p> <p>Maryland State Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), Linthicum, MD, servicing the entire State of Maryland</p>	<p>Maryland Inter Agency Law Enforcement System, Maryland State Police, Pikesville, MD, servicing all locations in the State of Maryland</p>	<p>Maryland State Police, Baltimore, MD, with access to MD CJIS serving as State-Wide Repository for criminal records</p>	<p>Maryland State Police Criminal Justice Information System, serving the State of Maryland</p>

State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
<b>ME</b>	<p>Maine State Police (MSP), Augusta, ME, serving as the central repository of all criminal records with in the state of Maine.</p> <p>Department of Motor Vehicles, State of Maine, Augusta, ME, serving the entire state as central repository for all traffic violations.</p>	Maine State Police (MSP), Bureau of Identification, Augusta, ME, servicing all locations in the State of Maine	<p>Maine State Bureau of Identification, Augusta, ME. Maine State Bureau of Identification is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of Maine</p> <p>Maine State Police, State Bureau of Identification, Augusta, ME, covers the entire state</p>	
<b>MI</b>	<p>Michigan Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN), which maintains a database of arrest, citation and conviction information for all police departments in the State of Michigan</p> <p>Michigan State Police (MSP), Central Records Division, Lansing, MI</p> <p>Michigan Secretary of State</p>	Michigan State Police, Criminal Records Unit, Lansing, MI, servicing all locations in the State of Michigan	<p>Michigan Criminal Justice Information Center, Lansing, MI, which is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of Michigan</p> <p>Statewide Central Records Division, Lansing, MI, covering the entire state of Michigan</p> <p>SW Central Records Division, covering the entire state of MI</p>	Michigan State Police, serving all jurisdictions within Michigan
<b>MN</b>	Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension and Department of Public Safety (MBCA/DPS), St. Paul, MN, a repository for all criminal and motor vehicle driving records within the State of Minnesota	Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, St. Paul, MN, servicing all locations in the State of Minnesota	Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, St Paul, MN. Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of MN.	
<b>MO</b>	<p>Regional Justice Information Service (REJIS), St. Louis, MO, which maintains arrest records for all police departments in Missouri</p> <p>Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP), Division of Alcohol/Traffic Offenses, Jefferson City, MO</p> <p>Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP), Division of Drug and Crime Control, Jefferson City, MO</p> <p>Missouri Department of Revenue, Jefferson City, MO</p>	Criminal Records Division, Missouri State Police, Jefferson City, MO, servicing all locations in the State of Missouri	<p>Criminal Record and Identification Division, covering the entire state of Missouri</p> <p>Missouri State Highway Patrol, Jefferson City, MO. The Missouri State Highway Patrol is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of Missouri</p> <p>SW Criminal Record &amp; Identification Division, covering the entire state of Missouri</p>	

State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
MS	<p>Mississippi Department of Public Safety, Criminal Information Center (MSCIC), Jackson, MS. No details of the arrest could be provided as CIC is only a central repository for felony arrests in Mississippi.</p> <p>Mississippi Department of Public Safety, Driver History Division (MDPSDHD), as revealed through the MSCIC</p>		<p>Mississippi Department of Public Safety, Mississippi Justice Information Center, Pearl, MS</p> <p>Mississippi Department of Public Safety, Mississippi Highway Patrol, Criminal Investigation Bureau, Pearl, MS</p> <p>Mississippi Department of Public Safety, Driver Services Division, Jackson, MS</p> <p>Mississippi Department of Public Safety, Mississippi Bureau of Narcotics, Pearl, MS</p>	
MT	<p>Montana State Criminal Justice Information Network, Helena, MT, repository for all cities, county and state criminal and traffic records for the State of Montana.</p> <p>Montana Department of Justice, Motor Vehicle Division, Helena, MT</p>	<p>Montana Department of Justice, Bureau of Identification, Helena, MT servicing all locations in the State of Montana</p>	<p>Montana State Department of Criminal Justice, Helena, MT, covers entire state</p>	
NC	<p>Criminal Infractions Systems (CIS), Raleigh, NC, statewide repository for all felony, misdemeanor arrest, and traffic violation information, servicing all law enforcement agencies, to include police departments, sheriff departments, and courts in the State of North Carolina.</p> <p>North Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles, Raleigh, NC</p>			
NE	<p>Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles</p>			



State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
<b>NH</b>	<p>Bureau of Identification, State of New Hampshire (NHSP), Concord, NH, serving the entire state as central repository for all criminal information.</p> <p>State of New Hampshire, Department of Safety, Division of the State Police, 10 Hazen Drive, Concord, NH, serving the entire state as central repository for all criminal information.</p> <p>State of New Hampshire, Department of Safety, Division of Motor Vehicles, Concord, NH, servicing the entire state, as the central records repository of all motor vehicle licenses; registrations; accidents; and, offenses.</p>	New Hampshire State Police, Criminal Records Unit, Concord, NH, servicing all locations in the State of New Hampshire	New Hampshire State Police, Concord, NH. New Hampshire State Police is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of New Hampshire	New Hampshire Department of Safety, Division of State Police, serving the entire state of New Hampshire
<b>NJ</b>	<p>Computerized records of Headquarters, New Jersey State Police (NJSP), and computerized records of Automated Complaint Systems (ACS), Trenton, NJ AKA Headquarters, New Jersey State Police (NJSP), Trenton, NJ</p> <p>Computerized records of Promise/Gavel, (centralized repository for NJ court dispositions), Trenton, NJ (N=1)</p> <p>NJ Division of Motor Vehicles, Trenton, NJ</p>	New Jersey State Police, Criminal Information Unit, West Trenton, NJ, servicing all locations in the State of New Jersey	<p>Department of Law and Public Safety, West Trenton, NJ. The Department of Law and Public Safety is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the state of New Jersey</p> <p>New Jersey State Police, State Bureau of Investigation, Trenton, NJ, covers the entire state</p>	New Jersey State Police, serving all jurisdictions in the State of New Jersey
<b>NM</b>	State of New Mexico, Taxation and Revenue Department, Motor Vehicle Division, Santa Fe, NM			
<b>NV</b>	<p>Nevada Criminal Justice Information System (NCJIS), Las Vegas, NV, which contains central indices for all city, county, and state law enforcement agencies</p> <p>Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles</p>			

State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
<b>NY</b>	<p>New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, Albany, NY, servicing the entire state of New York as central repository for all reportable criminal history record information.</p> <p>New York State Department of Motor Vehicles (NYSDMV), Albany, NY</p>		New York State Police, Troop D, Oneida, NY, covers entire state	
<b>OH</b>	<p>Law Enforcement Automated Data System (LEADS), Columbus, OH, servicing the State of Ohio</p> <p>Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation (OBCII), Columbus, OH, serving the State of Ohio</p>			
<b>OK</b>			Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation, Oklahoma City, OK	
<b>OR</b>		Oregon State Police, Bend, OR, servicing all locations in the State of Oregon (N=1)		
<b>PA</b>	<p>Pennsylvania State Police, Commonwealth Law Enforcement Assistance Network (CLEAN), Harrisburg, PA, servicing all areas within the State of Pennsylvania (CLEAN contains misdemeanor, felony, and selected summary arrests made within the State of Pennsylvania.)</p> <p>Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Bureau of Driver Licensing, Harrisburg, PA</p>	Pennsylvania State Police Central Repository, Harrisburg, PA, servicing all locations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania State Police Central Repository, Harrisburg, PA. Pennsylvania State Police Central Repository is the Central Repository for all arrest records for the State of Pennsylvania	
<b>PR</b>	Headquarters, Puerto Rico Police Department, Criminal Division, San Juan, PR, servicing the complete Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.	Puerto Rico Police Department (PRPD), servicing the entire Island of Puerto Rico	Puerto Rico Police Department, serving the entire Island of Puerto Rico	Puerto Rico Police Department, Hate Rye, Puerto Rico, serving all of Puerto Rico

State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
RI	<p>Rhode Island Bureau of Criminal Identification, Providence, RI, a central records repository for state criminal arrest information servicing all towns, cities &amp; municipalities in Rhode Island</p> <p>State of Rhode Island, Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV), Pawtucket, RI</p>	Rhode Island State Division of Criminal Identification, Providence, RI, servicing all locations in the State of Rhode Island	Bureau of Criminal Identification, Providence, RI. Bureau of Criminal Identification is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of Rhode Island	
SC	<p>South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SLED), Columbia, SC. (SLED is the computerized criminal history records repository for all state and local law enforcement agencies in the State of SC.)</p> <p>South Carolina Department of Public Safety, Division of Motor Vehicles, (South Carolina Highway Patrol (SCHP)), Columbia, SC</p>	<p>South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SCLED), Columbia, SC, servicing all locations in the State of South Carolina</p> <p>South Carolina Crime Information Center, Columbia, SC, servicing all locations in the State of South Carolina</p>	South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SLED), Columbia, SC, a statewide database serving all of South Carolina.	<p>South Carolina Law Enforcement Division, serving the entire State of South Carolina</p> <p>South Carolina Statewide Police</p> <p>South Carolina Statewide Police, serving all jurisdictions within the State of South Carolina</p>
SD	Unified Judicial System, State of South Dakota			
TN	Tennessee Bureau of Investigation (TBI), Records and Identification Unit, Nashville, TN, the computerized central history record repository for felonies and misdemeanors for the State of Tennessee.			
TX	Texas Crime Information Center (TCIC), Austin, TX, a computerized identification and criminal history record information system for Texas Law Enforcement Agencies		<p>Texas Department of Public Safety Records Section, Austin, TX, is the central repository for all arrest records in the state of Texas</p> <p>Crime Record Service (CRS), Austin, TX, which serves as the central criminal record repository for all arrest records in the state of Texas</p> <p>SW Department of Public Safety Records Section, TX.</p>	<p>Texas Department of Public Safety, serving all jurisdictions within the State of Texas</p> <p>AKA</p> <p>Texas Statewide Department of Public Safety Database, TX</p> <p>AKA</p> <p>Texas State Police, serving all jurisdictions within the State of TX</p> <p>AKA</p> <p>Texas Statewide Police</p>

State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
UT	Utah Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Identification, Salt Lake City, UT. (Local agency checks for the State of Utah are conducted centrally.)		Utah Bureau of Criminal Identification, Taylorsville, UT, the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of Utah	
VA	Central Criminal Records Exchange (CCRE), Virginia State Police, Richmond, VA. The CCRE is the central repository for all felony and serious misdemeanor arrest information through the Commonwealth of Virginia.  Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), Commonwealth of Virginia, 5010 Airport Road, Roanoke, VA	Virginia State Police, Central Criminal Records Exchange (CCRE), Richmond, VA, servicing all locations in the Commonwealth of Virginia	Virginia State Police, Central Criminal Records Exchange (CCRE), Richmond, VA, covers the entire state	Virginia State Police, Richmond, VA serving all the jurisdictions within the Commonwealth of Virginia AKA Virginia Statewide Police check, Investigative Support Unit, VA serving all jurisdictions within the Commonwealth of Virginia AKA Virginia Statewide Police, serving as a repository for all local agency arrest records within the Commonwealth of Virginia
VT	State of Vermont (SOV), Department of Public Safety, VT State Police, Waterbury, VT.  State of Vermont, Department of Motor Vehicles, Montpelier, VT	Vermont Criminal Information Center, Waterbury, VT, servicing all locations in the State of Vermont	State of Vermont Department of Public Safety, Waterbury, VT, State of Vermont Department of Public Safety is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of Vermont	
WA	Washington Crime Information Center (WACIC), a computerized criminal history record information system for all law enforcement agencies in the state of Washington	Washington State Police, Criminal Records Unit, Olympia, WA, servicing all locations in the State of Washington	Washington State Patrol, Identification Section, Olympia, WA, covers police/sheriff's criminal records, statewide  SW Washington State Police, covering the entire State of Washington (N=2)	Washington State Patrol, Washington Access to Criminal History, serving as a repository for all criminal records in the State of Washington  Washington Statewide Police, serving Tacoma, WA

State	DSS	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3
WI	<p>Wisconsin Department of Justice, Criminal Information Bureau, Madison, WI, statewide repository for all felony and serious misdemeanor arrest information, servicing all law enforcement agencies and courts in the State of Wisconsin</p> <p>National Law Enforcement Telecommunication Enforcement System (NLETS), which maintains arrests records for police departments in various states, this check for the State of Wisconsin</p> <p>State of Wisconsin, Consolidated Court Automation Program(CCAP), a state computer system that contains access to all circuit court information</p> <p>Wisconsin Identification Data (WID) system by ECDAO, Eau Claire, WI</p>		Wisconsin Dept Of Justice, covering the entire state of Wisconsin	
WY	<p>Wyoming Division of Criminal Identification (WDCI), Cheyenne, WY, a computerized identification and criminal history record system for all Wyoming law enforcement agencies</p> <p>Wyoming Department of Transportation (WDOT), Driver Record Information Section (DRIS), Cheyenne, WY, the repository for vehicle operator records</p>	Wyoming State Police, Division of Criminal Investigation, Cheyenne, WY servicing all locations in the State of Wyoming. [C2180] (22 Mar 02)	Division of Criminal Investigations, Cheyenne, WY, Division of Criminal Investigations is the Central Repository for all arrest records in the State of Wyoming	



**Appendix E**

**Record Check Strategies by State**





**Proportion of All Record Checks Conducted at Each Type of Criminal Justice Agency, by Investigative Agency and State (Does Not Indicate If Record Found)**

<i>State</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Court %</i>	<i>LEA %</i>	<i>State %</i>	<i>Total # of Checks</i>
AK	Federal agent	10.4	0.7	88.8	268
	Contractor1	37.9	56.9	5.2	58
	Contractor2	38.6	59.1	2.3	44
	Contractor3	16.7	83.3		6
	Total	18.1	17.6	64.4	376
AL	Federal agent	12.5	6.3	81.1	1,899
	Contractor1	7.9	25.6	66.5	340
	Contractor2	5.4	27.6	66.9	257
	Contractor3	2.4	97.6		41
	Total	11.0	12.5	76.4	2,537
AR	Federal agent	26.2	11.0	62.8	481
	Contractor1	22.8	74.7	2.5	158
	Contractor2	41.5	46.3	12.2	147
	Contractor3		100.0		1
	Total	28.3	30.5	41.2	787
AZ	Federal agent	18.2	10.8	71.0	2,163
	Contractor1	7.4	92.6		663
	Contractor2	6.0	94.0		467
	Contractor3		100.0		46
	Total	14.1	39.9	46.0	3,339
CA	Federal agent	20.8	79.2		17,541
	Contractor1	3.5	96.4	0.0	2,297
	Contractor2	4.8	95.2		1,156
	Contractor3	1.4	98.6		288
	Total	17.8	82.2	0.0	21,282
CO	Federal agent	16.3	4.3	79.5	1,524
	Contractor1	9.6	10.3	80.1	261
	Contractor2	5.0	12.6	82.4	238
	Contractor3	2.7	82.7	14.7	75
	Total	13.7	8.8	77.6	2,098
CT	Federal agent	5.3	43.7	51.0	1,850
	Contractor1	1.8	4.7	93.5	169
	Contractor2	6.3	78.2	15.5	142
	Contractor3		72.7	27.3	11
	Total	5.1	43.0	51.9	2,172
DC	Federal agent	1.4	98.6		2,597
	Contractor1	1.4	98.6		208
	Contractor2	1.1	98.9		185
	Contractor3		100.0		46
	Total	1.4	98.6		3,036

**Proportion of All Record Checks Conducted at Each Type of Criminal Justice Agency, by Investigative Agency and State (Does Not Indicate If Record Found)**

<i>State</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Court %</i>	<i>LEA %</i>	<i>State %</i>	<i>Total # of Checks</i>
DE	Federal agent	14.1	1.7	84.2	241
	Contractor1	15.0	5.0	80.0	20
	Contractor2	8.3	25.0	66.7	24
	Total	13.7	3.9	82.5	285
FL	Federal agent	28.0	72.0		4,301
	Contractor1	4.9	94.7	0.3	1,214
	Contractor2	5.1	94.1	0.8	769
	Contractor3	7.9	92.1		164
	Total	20.4	79.5	0.2	6,448
GA	Federal agent	22.6	9.8	67.6	2,389
	Contractor1	7.3	6.0	86.7	301
	Contractor2	6.9	30.2	62.9	248
	Contractor3	5.5	90.9	3.6	55
	Total	19.4	12.6	68.0	2,993
HI	Federal agent	2.4	4.0	93.5	1,457
	Contractor1	5.3	40.9	53.8	132
	Contractor2	1.4	21.1	77.6	147
	Contractor3			100.0	31
	Total	2.5	8.1	89.4	1,767
IA	Federal agent	10.8	89.2		1,744
	Contractor1	10.9	89.1		128
	Contractor2	15.9	84.1		88
	Contractor3		100.0		1
	Total	11.0	89.0		1,961
ID	Federal agent	6.8	93.2		512
	Contractor1	6.6	93.4		76
	Contractor2	2.9	94.3	2.9	35
	Contractor3		100.0		5
	Total	6.5	93.3	0.2	628
IL	Federal agent	13.1	9.2	77.7	1,733
	Contractor1	7.0	92.8	0.2	488
	Contractor2	5.2	39.0	55.9	213
	Contractor3		100.0		47
	Total	11.0	29.9	59.1	2,481
IN	Federal agent	8.6	91.1	0.3	1,692
	Contractor1	5.9	94.1		186
	Contractor2	6.5	93.5		93
	Contractor3		100.0		7
	Total	8.2	91.5	0.3	1,978
KS	Federal agent	8.7	37.2	54.1	933
	Contractor1	8.4	90.7	0.9	214
	Contractor2	6.9	80.5	12.6	87
	Contractor3		100.0		25

**Proportion of All Record Checks Conducted at Each Type of Criminal Justice Agency, by Investigative Agency and State (Does Not Indicate If Record Found)**

<i>State</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Court %</i>	<i>LEA %</i>	<i>State %</i>	<i>Total # of Checks</i>
	Total	8.3	50.5	41.1	1,259
KY	Federal agent	91.1	8.9		853
	Contractor1	17.3	82.7		254
	Contractor2	21.3	78.7		150
	Contractor3	10.0	90.0		10
	Total	67.4	32.6		1,267
LA	Federal agent	8.8	91.1	0.1	2,746
	Contractor1	4.5	95.5		244
	Contractor2	9.6	90.4		146
	Contractor3		100.0		27
	Total	8.4	91.5	0.1	3,163
MA	Federal agent	8.1	3.7	88.2	1,880
	Contractor1	6.1	3.8	90.1	345
	Contractor2	7.7	9.6	82.7	156
	Contractor3	5.6	79.2	15.3	72
	Total	7.7	6.3	86.0	2,453
MD	Federal agent	9.3	3.6	87.1	4,924
	Contractor1	4.3	61.8	33.9	767
	Contractor2	2.8	90.0	7.2	720
	Contractor3	3.8	95.5	0.8	132
	Total	7.9	21.8	70.4	6,543
ME	Federal agent	8.2	14.2	77.7	318
	Contractor1	8.3	14.6	77.1	48
	Contractor2	19.2	26.9	53.8	26
	Contractor3		100.0		17
	Total	8.6	18.6	72.9	409
MI	Federal agent	18.9	8.5	72.5	971
	Contractor1	7.0	35.0	58.0	143
	Contractor2	14.4	50.8	34.8	132
	Contractor3		95.5	4.5	22
	Total	16.8	17.4	65.8	1,268
MN	Federal agent	14.2	11.8	74.1	621
	Contractor1	9.9	19.8	70.3	101
	Contractor2	7.5	73.6	18.9	106
	Contractor3		100.0		27
	Total	12.4	23.2	64.4	855
MO	Federal agent	9.5	8.1	82.4	1,523
	Contractor1	4.2	94.9	0.8	474
	Contractor2	7.9	49.5	42.6	190
	Contractor3		100.0		36
	Total	8.1	31.6	60.3	2,223

**Proportion of All Record Checks Conducted at Each Type of Criminal Justice Agency, by Investigative Agency and State (Does Not Indicate If Record Found)**

<i>State</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Court %</i>	<i>LEA %</i>	<i>State %</i>	<i>Total # of Checks</i>
MS	Federal agent	7.3	87.2	5.5	1,109
	Contractor1	7.6	92.4		198
	Contractor2	13.1	78.6	8.3	84
	Contractor3	5.0	95.0		20
	Total	7.7	87.5	4.8	1,411
MT	Federal agent	11.7	22.7	65.5	264
	Contractor1	13.6	54.5	31.8	44
	Contractor2	7.1	85.7	7.1	14
	Contractor3		100.0		2
	Total	11.7	30.2	58.0	324
NC	Federal agent	15.9	0.5	83.6	1,832
	Contractor1	28.8	71.0	0.2	438
	Contractor2	40.3	59.7		315
	Contractor3	26.2	73.8		65
	Total	21.2	21.0	57.8	2,650
ND	Federal agent	6.6	93.4		728
	Contractor1	9.5	90.5		42
	Contractor2	6.3	93.8		64
	Contractor3		100.0		2
	Total	6.7	93.3		836
NE	Federal agent	11.2	88.8		1,255
	Contractor1	5.6	94.4		90
	Contractor2	6.0	94.0		83
	Contractor3	10.5	89.5		19
	Total	10.5	89.5		1,447
NH	Federal agent	3.4	1.1	95.5	560
	Contractor1	4.9	11.8	83.3	102
	Contractor2	1.6	67.2	31.3	64
	Contractor3		91.7	8.3	12
	Total	3.4	9.8	86.9	738
NJ	Federal agent	12.7	3.9	83.3	1,672
	Contractor1	4.0	2.4	93.6	251
	Contractor2	2.6	23.9	73.5	117
	Contractor3		86.5	13.5	37
	Total	10.9	6.4	82.8	2,077
NM	Federal agent	9.0	91.0		1,818
	Contractor1	4.3	95.7		208
	Contractor2	4.5	95.5		111
	Contractor3		100.0		16
	Total	8.2	91.8		2,153

**Proportion of All Record Checks Conducted at Each Type of Criminal Justice Agency, by Investigative Agency and State (Does Not Indicate If Record Found)**

<i>State</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Court %</i>	<i>LEA %</i>	<i>State %</i>	<i>Total # of Checks</i>
NV	Federal agent	7.6	62.7	29.7	740
	Contractor1	1.5	98.5		68
	Contractor2	7.1	92.9		56
	Contractor3	7.7	92.3		13
	Total	7.1	67.8	25.1	877
NY	Federal agent	6.1	51.1	42.8	4,199
	Contractor1	13.0	87.0		678
	Contractor2	17.5	81.8	0.7	291
	Contractor3	6.3	93.7		63
	Total	7.6	57.9	34.4	5,231
OH	Federal agent	12.9	10.0	77.1	1,692
	Contractor1	7.0	93.0		513
	Contractor2	4.5	95.5		355
	Contractor3		100.0		44
	Total	10.4	39.5	50.1	2,604
OK	Federal agent	6.8	93.2		2,363
	Contractor1	3.9	96.1		306
	Contractor2	5.3	94.1	0.5	188
	Contractor3		100.0		26
	Total	6.3	93.6	0.0	2,883
OR	Federal agent	14.7	85.1	0.2	994
	Contractor1	9.4	89.9	0.7	139
	Contractor2	7.0	90.7	2.3	43
	Contractor3		100.0		6
	Total	13.7	86.0	0.3	1,182
PA	Federal agent	23.8	61.7	14.5	5,518
	Contractor1	8.5	86.2	5.2	667
	Contractor2	14.9	80.6	4.5	377
	Contractor3	4.5	87.9	7.6	66
	Total	21.5	65.5	12.9	6,628
PR	Federal agent	2.6	2.2	95.2	229
	Contractor1		4.8	95.2	21
	Contractor2		20.0	80.0	25
	Contractor3			100.0	4
	Total	2.2	3.9	93.9	279
RI	Federal agent	8.3	5.4	86.3	410
	Contractor1	2.2	20.7	77.2	92
	Contractor2	2.4	41.7	56.0	84
	Contractor3		100.0		16
	Total	6.3	15.3	78.4	602

**Proportion of All Record Checks Conducted at Each Type of Criminal Justice Agency, by Investigative Agency and State (Does Not Indicate If Record Found)**

<i>State</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Court %</i>	<i>LEA %</i>	<i>State %</i>	<i>Total # of Checks</i>
SC	Federal agent	13.6	7.7	78.6	1,021
	Contractor1	3.7	15.9	80.4	189
	Contractor2	4.2	15.8	80.0	120
	Contractor3		64.3	35.7	14
	Total	11.2	10.2	78.6	1,344
SD	Federal agent	10.5	88.9	0.6	314
	Contractor1	20.0	80.0		40
	Contractor2	5.7	94.3		35
	Contractor3	20.0	80.0		5
	Total	11.2	88.3	0.5	394
TN	Federal agent	20.0	79.9	0.1	1,658
	Contractor1	26.8	73.2		276
	Contractor2	27.1	72.9		140
	Contractor3	14.3	85.7		7
	Total	21.3	78.6	0.1	2,081
TX	Federal agent	15.1	15.0	69.8	5,197
	Contractor1	6.5	93.5	0.1	1,910
	Contractor2	6.8	62.0	31.1	848
	Contractor3	2.1	90.8	7.0	142
	Total	12.0	39.8	48.2	8,097
UT	Federal agent	20.6	8.6	70.8	637
	Contractor1	5.4	94.6		297
	Contractor2	4.8	45.2	50.0	62
	Contractor3		100.0		38
	Total	14.5	38.9	46.6	1,034
VA	Federal agent	9.2	3.7	87.1	9,511
	Contractor1	3.3	64.9	31.9	1,673
	Contractor2	3.9	71.9	24.2	1,366
	Contractor3	2.6	6.2	91.1	305
	Total	7.7	18.9	73.3	12,855
VT	Federal agent	26.5	1.7	71.8	117
	Contractor1	15.4	7.7	76.9	13
	Contractor2		42.9	57.1	7
	Total	24.1	4.4	71.5	137
WA	Federal agent	14.3	27.7	58.0	2,020
	Contractor1	6.7	9.3	84.0	194
	Contractor2	6.5	81.5	12.0	200
	Contractor3	2.2	91.3	6.5	46
	Total	12.8	31.8	55.3	2,460

**Proportion of All Record Checks Conducted at Each Type of Criminal Justice Agency, by Investigative Agency and State (Does Not Indicate If Record Found)**

<i>State</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Court %</i>	<i>LEA %</i>	<i>State %</i>	<i>Total # of Checks</i>
WI	Federal agent	17.8	43.9	38.3	995
	Contractor1	12.1	86.8	1.1	174
	Contractor2	12.1	81.0	6.9	58
	Contractor3	5.0	95.0		20
	Total	16.5	52.4	31.0	1,247
WV	Federal agent	53.6	45.3	1.0	977
	Contractor1	20.4	79.6		108
	Contractor2	16.7	83.3		18
	Contractor3	25.0	50.0	25.0	4
	Total	49.7	49.3	1.0	1,107
WY	Federal agent	11.7	11.1	77.2	180
	Contractor1	19.2	26.9	53.8	26
	Contractor2	8.3	58.3	33.3	24
	Contractor3		100.0		4
	Total	12.0	19.2	68.8	234





**Appendix F**

**Data Supporting Figures 3 through 5**



Self Reported Arrests, Charges, or Convictions on PSQ	State	# Ss Contractor Finds	# Ss DSS Finds	Total # Ss Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by DSS	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference Feds - Contractors	Odds Contractor Find	Odds Fed Find	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by DSS
Yes	AL	16	119	75	286	361	20.3	0.27	0.71	0.38	2.63
Yes	AR	11	44	28	96	124	6.5	0.65	0.85	0.76	1.31
Yes	AZ	29	122	90	336	426	4.1	0.48	0.57	0.83	1.20
Yes	CA	49	336	241	1344	1585	4.7	0.26	0.33	0.77	1.31
Yes	CO	18	121	75	247	322	25.0	0.32	0.96	0.33	3.04
Yes	DC	3	18	33	202	235	-0.2	0.10	0.10	1.02	0.98
Yes	FL	43	155	153	455	608	6.0	0.39	0.52	0.76	1.32
Yes	GA	25	212	99	445	544	22.4	0.34	0.91	0.37	2.69
Yes	HI	2	44	34	212	246	14.9	0.06	0.26	0.24	4.19
Yes	IL	23	106	56	257	313	0.2	0.70	0.70	0.99	1.01
Yes	IN	10	47	35	99	134	18.9	0.40	0.90	0.44	2.26
Yes	KY	21	52	52	108	160	7.8	0.68	0.93	0.73	1.37
Yes	LA	9	71	25	185	210	2.4	0.56	0.62	0.90	1.11
Yes	MA	4	13	20	76	96	-2.9	0.25	0.21	1.21	0.83
Yes	MD	18	292	99	678	777	24.9	0.22	0.76	0.29	3.40
Yes	MI	16	66	37	137	174	4.9	0.76	0.93	0.82	1.22
Yes	MN	9	61	29	122	151	19.0	0.45	1.00	0.45	2.22
Yes	MO	13	112	62	221	283	29.7	0.27	1.03	0.26	3.87
Yes	NC	20	141	72	318	390	16.6	0.38	0.80	0.48	2.07
Yes	NJ	6	80	35	202	237	22.5	0.21	0.66	0.32	3.17
Yes	NM	7	36	32	89	121	18.6	0.28	0.68	0.41	2.43
Yes	NY	15	65	47	210	257	-1.0	0.47	0.45	1.05	0.96
Yes	OH	19	127	45	232	277	12.5	0.73	1.21	0.60	1.66
Yes	OK	7	30	25	125	150	-4.0	0.39	0.32	1.23	0.81
Yes	OR	7	24	21	88	109	-6.1	0.50	0.38	1.33	0.75
Yes	PA	21	123	70	292	362	12.1	0.43	0.73	0.59	1.70
Yes	SC	7	69	37	181	218	19.2	0.23	0.62	0.38	2.64

Self Reported Arrests, Charges, or Convictions on PSQ	State	# Ss Contractor Finds	# Ss DSS Finds	Total # Ss Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by DSS	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference Feds - Contractors	Odds Contractor Find	Odds Fed Find	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by DSS
Yes	TN	9	46	39	165	204	4.8	0.30	0.39	0.78	1.29
Yes	Tot	627	3761	2214	10226	12440	8.1			0.91	1.75
Yes	TX	85	382	210	892	1102	2.3	0.68	0.75	0.91	1.10
Yes	UT	8	32	23	75	98	7.9	0.53	0.74	0.72	1.40
Yes	VA	52	475	216	1410	1626	9.6	0.32	0.51	0.62	1.60
Yes	WA	10	64	49	268	317	3.5	0.26	0.31	0.82	1.22
Yes	WI	17	52	30	130	160	-16.7	1.31	0.67	1.96	0.51
No	AK	2	6	53	167	220	-0.2	0.04	0.04	1.05	0.95
No	AL	3	74	390	1139	1529	5.7	0.01	0.07	0.11	8.96
No	AR	4	41	81	257	338	11.0	0.05	0.19	0.27	3.65
No	AZ	13	49	390	1051	1441	1.3	0.03	0.05	0.71	1.42
No	CA	34	207	1298	5804	7102	0.9	0.03	0.04	0.73	1.37
No	CO	9	47	334	832	1166	3.0	0.03	0.06	0.46	2.16
No	CT	0	7	75	270	345	2.6	0.00	0.03	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	DC	0	11	343	1844	2187	0.6	0.00	0.01	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	DE	0	17	29	143	172	11.9	0.00	0.13	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	FL	25	107	695	2009	2704	1.7	0.04	0.06	0.66	1.51
No	GA	10	132	335	1155	1490	8.4	0.03	0.13	0.24	4.19
No	HI	2	42	230	956	1186	3.5	0.01	0.05	0.19	5.24
No	IA	9	41	68	361	429	-1.9	0.15	0.13	1.19	0.84
No	ID	0	6	30	108	138	5.6	0.00	0.06	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	IL	14	85	283	942	1225	4.1	0.05	0.10	0.52	1.91
No	IN	3	48	100	468	568	7.3	0.03	0.11	0.27	3.70
No	KS	7	27	117	487	604	-0.4	0.06	0.06	1.08	0.92
No	KY	6	30	153	354	507	4.6	0.04	0.09	0.44	2.27
No	LA	10	45	141	743	884	-1.0	0.08	0.06	1.18	0.84

Self Reported Arrests, Charges, or Convictions on PSQ	State	# Ss Contractor Finds	# Ss DSS Finds	Total # Ss Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by DSS	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference Feds - Contractors	Odds Contractor Find	Odds Fed Find	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by DSS
No	MA	2	17	145	440	585	2.5	0.01	0.04	0.35	2.87
No	MD	18	144	889	3051	3940	2.7	0.02	0.05	0.42	2.40
No	MI	7	45	122	533	655	2.7	0.06	0.09	0.66	1.51
No	MN	7	31	99	319	418	2.6	0.08	0.11	0.71	1.41
No	MO	8	70	271	902	1173	4.8	0.03	0.08	0.36	2.77
No	MS	3	14	119	326	445	1.8	0.03	0.04	0.58	1.74
No	NC	30	131	316	1023	1339	3.3	0.10	0.15	0.71	1.40
No	ND	0	9	33	150	183	6.0	0.00	0.06	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	NE	4	25	87	331	418	3.0	0.05	0.08	0.59	1.70
No	NH	1	4	34	115	149	0.5	0.03	0.04	0.84	1.19
No	NJ	7	78	271	956	1227	5.6	0.03	0.09	0.30	3.35
No	NM	5	31	108	604	712	0.5	0.05	0.05	0.90	1.11
No	NV	2	15	59	425	484	0.1	0.04	0.04	0.96	1.04
No	NY	8	32	242	1099	1341	-0.4	0.03	0.03	1.14	0.88
No	OH	5	59	261	936	1197	4.4	0.02	0.07	0.29	3.44
No	OK	4	23	132	553	685	1.1	0.03	0.04	0.72	1.39
No	OR	6	15	45	206	251	-6.1	0.15	0.08	1.96	0.51
No	PA	12	90	318	1273	1591	3.3	0.04	0.08	0.52	1.94
No	RI	0	4	63	99	162	4.0	0.00	0.04	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	SC	11	49	212	594	806	3.1	0.05	0.09	0.61	1.64
No	SD	4	11	30	93	123	-1.5	0.15	0.13	1.15	0.87
No	TN	8	27	180	597	777	0.1	0.05	0.05	0.98	1.02
No	TX	37	188	959	2656	3615	3.2	0.04	0.08	0.53	1.90
No	UT	7	11	98	342	440	-3.9	0.08	0.03	2.31	0.43
No	VA	28	225	1596	5740	7336	2.2	0.02	0.04	0.44	2.28
No	WA	6	30	215	1005	1220	0.2	0.03	0.03	0.93	1.07
No	WI	9	16	52	297	349	-11.9	0.21	0.06	3.68	0.27

Self Reported Arrests, Charges, or Convictions on PSQ	State	# Ss Contractor Finds	# Ss DSS Finds	Total # Ss Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by DSS	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference Feds - Contractors	Odds Contractor Find	Odds Fed Find	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by DSS
No	WV	0	18	55	225	280	8.0	0.00	0.09	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	WY	0	2	23	86	109	2.3	0.00	0.02	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	Total	390	2436	12179	44066	56245	2.7	0.04	0.07	0.66	2.00
STATES WITH FEWER THAN 20 SUBJECTS INVESTIGATED BY ONE TYPE OF INVESTIGATOR											
Yes	AK	4	13	15	37	52	8.5	0.36	0.54	0.67	1.49
Yes	CT	0	9	10	71	81	12.7	0.00	0.15	0.00	#DIV/0!
Yes	DE	2	13	5	29	34	4.8	0.67	0.81	0.82	1.22
Yes	IA	8	78	17	148	165	5.6	0.89	1.11	0.80	1.25
Yes	ID	3	12	9	25	34	14.7	0.50	0.92	0.54	1.85
Yes	KS	6	23	18	72	90	-1.4	0.50	0.47	1.07	0.94
No	ME	1	2	18	96	114	-3.5	0.06	0.02	2.76	0.36
Yes	ME	2	7	6	24	30	-4.2	0.50	0.41	1.21	0.82
Yes	MS	6	10	19	71	90	-17.5	0.46	0.16	2.82	0.36
No	MT	1	3	12	80	92	-4.6	0.09	0.04	2.33	0.43
Yes	MT	0	10	6	30	36	33.3	0.00	0.50	0.00	#DIV/0!
Yes	ND	1	10	10	40	50	15.0	0.11	0.33	0.33	3.00
Yes	NE	6	46	15	102	117	5.1	0.67	0.82	0.81	1.23
Yes	NH	1	5	4	22	26	-2.3	0.33	0.29	1.13	0.88
Yes	NV	4	25	14	102	116	-4.1	0.40	0.32	1.23	0.81
Yes	RI	0	3	6	19	25	15.8	0.00	0.19	0.00	#DIV/0!
Yes	SD	1	28	6	51	57	38.2	0.20	1.22	0.16	6.09
No	UK	6	13	12	37	49	-14.9	1.00	0.54	1.85	0.54
No	VI	0	0	10	29	39	0.0	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
No	VT	0	0	8	27	35	0.0	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Yes	VT	0	3	0	9	9	33.0	#DIV/0!	0.50	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Yes	WV	4	18	7	44	51	-16.2	1.33	0.69	1.93	0.52
Yes	WY	1	6	5	29	34	0.7	0.25	0.26	0.96	1.04

Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
No	NACLC	AK	2	4	33	124	157	-2.8	0.06	0.03	1.94	0.52
No	NACLC	AL	2	72	281	981	1262	6.6	0.01	0.08	0.09	11.05
No	NACLC	AR	4	39	61	238	299	9.8	0.07	0.20	0.36	2.79
No	NACLC	AZ	12	39	249	783	1032	0.2	0.05	0.05	0.97	1.04
No	NACLC	CA	32	179	807	4238	5045	0.3	0.04	0.04	0.94	1.07
No	NACLC	CO	7	41	150	594	744	2.2	0.05	0.07	0.66	1.51
No	NACLC	CT	0	2	63	208	271	1.0	0.00	0.01	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	NACLC	DC	0	10	142	904	1046	1.1	0.00	0.01	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	NACLC	FL	21	91	404	1330	1734	1.6	0.05	0.07	0.75	1.34
No	NACLC	GA	7	125	206	991	1197	9.2	0.04	0.14	0.24	4.10
No	NACLC	HI	1	36	82	476	558	6.3	0.01	0.08	0.15	6.63
No	NACLC	IA	9	32	59	224	283	-1.0	0.18	0.17	1.08	0.93
No	NACLC	IL	12	75	167	646	813	4.4	0.08	0.13	0.59	1.70
No	NACLC	IN	3	39	79	367	446	6.8	0.04	0.12	0.33	3.01
No	NACLC	KS	7	26	70	309	379	-1.6	0.11	0.09	1.21	0.83
No	NACLC	KY	4	25	107	266	373	5.7	0.04	0.10	0.37	2.67
No	NACLC	LA	9	36	100	393	493	0.2	0.10	0.10	0.98	1.02
No	NACLC	MA	2	16	100	344	444	2.7	0.02	0.05	0.42	2.39
No	NACLC	MD	12	115	479	2171	2650	2.8	0.03	0.06	0.46	2.18
No	NACLC	MI	6	41	98	388	486	4.4	0.07	0.12	0.55	1.81
No	NACLC	MN	7	29	86	262	348	2.9	0.09	0.12	0.71	1.40
No	NACLC	MO	6	62	156	722	878	4.7	0.04	0.09	0.43	2.35
No	NACLC	MS	3	13	79	222	301	2.1	0.04	0.06	0.63	1.58
No	NACLC	NC	20	114	183	806	989	3.2	0.12	0.16	0.74	1.34
No	NACLC	NE	2	14	31	113	144	5.9	0.07	0.14	0.49	2.05
No	NACLC	NH	0	3	24	86	110	3.5	0.00	0.04	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	NACLC	NJ	6	73	190	820	1010	5.7	0.03	0.10	0.33	3.00
No	NACLC	NM	3	20	66	361	427	1.0	0.05	0.06	0.81	1.23
No	NACLC	NV	1	9	35	219	254	1.3	0.03	0.04	0.69	1.46

Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
No	NACLC	NY	7	29	171	726	897	-0.1	0.04	0.04	1.03	0.97
No	NACLC	OH	5	46	168	694	862	3.7	0.03	0.07	0.43	2.31
No	NACLC	OK	4	17	89	345	434	0.4	0.05	0.05	0.91	1.10
No	NACLC	OR	5	15	37	169	206	-4.6	0.16	0.10	1.60	0.62
No	NACLC	PA	12	71	233	946	1179	2.4	0.05	0.08	0.67	1.49
No	NACLC	RI	0	3	24	57	81	5.3	0.00	0.06	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	NACLC	SC	10	43	141	494	635	1.6	0.08	0.10	0.80	1.25
No	NACLC	TN	8	23	129	428	557	-0.8	0.07	0.06	1.16	0.86
No	NACLC	TX	35	166	589	2171	2760	1.7	0.06	0.08	0.76	1.31
No	NACLC	UT	6	9	72	258	330	-4.8	0.09	0.04	2.52	0.40
No	NACLC	VA	22	173	769	3883	4652	1.6	0.03	0.05	0.63	1.58
No	NACLC	WA	4	29	129	716	845	0.9	0.03	0.04	0.76	1.32
No	NACLC	WI	6	16	35	232	267	-10.2	0.21	0.07	2.79	0.36
No	NACLC	WV	0	15	44	168	212	8.9	0.00	0.10	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	NACLC	Total	324	2035	7217	30873	38090	2.2	0.06	0.08	0.72	1.96
No	PR	AL	1	0	94	87	181	-1.1	0.01	0.00	#DIV/0!	0.00
No	PR	AZ	1	3	128	112	240	1.9	0.01	0.03	0.29	3.50
No	PR	CA	2	8	440	565	1005	1.0	0.00	0.01	0.32	3.15
No	PR	CO	2	1	172	136	308	-0.4	0.01	0.01	1.59	0.63
No	PR	DC	0	1	174	690	864	0.1	0.00	0.00	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	PR	FL	2	3	256	342	598	0.1	0.01	0.01	0.89	1.12
No	PR	GA	1	1	115	94	209	0.2	0.01	0.01	0.82	1.23
No	PR	HI	1	4	137	235	372	1.0	0.01	0.02	0.42	2.35
No	PR	IL	2	0	90	64	154	-2.2	0.02	0.00	#DIV/0!	0.00
No	PR	KS	0	0	45	87	132	0.0	0.00	0.00	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
No	PR	KY	2	3	39	21	60	9.2	0.05	0.17	0.32	3.08
No	PR	LA	0	1	31	109	140	0.9	0.00	0.01	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	PR	MA	0	1	41	45	86	2.2	0.00	0.02	0.00	#DIV/0!



Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
No	PR	MD	3	6	362	448	810	0.5	0.01	0.01	0.62	1.62
No	PR	MO	0	3	97	81	178	3.7	0.00	0.04	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	PR	MS	0	1	28	38	66	2.6	0.00	0.03	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	PR	NC	9	4	114	87	201	-3.3	0.09	0.05	1.78	0.56
No	PR	ND	0	0	20	27	47	0.0	0.00	0.00	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
No	PR	NE	1	3	53	116	169	0.7	0.02	0.03	0.72	1.38
No	PR	NJ	1	1	66	53	119	0.4	0.02	0.02	0.80	1.25
No	PR	NM	2	4	37	120	157	-2.1	0.06	0.03	1.66	0.60
No	PR	NY	0	1	56	118	174	0.8	0.00	0.01	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	PR	OH	0	4	74	102	176	3.9	0.00	0.04	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	PR	OK	0	0	33	53	86	0.0	0.00	0.00	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
No	PR	PA	0	2	71	98	169	2.0	0.00	0.02	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	PR	RI	0	0	34	24	58	0.0	0.00	0.00	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
No	PR	SC	0	3	54	43	97	7.0	0.00	0.08	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	PR	TN	0	0	45	49	94	0.0	0.00	0.00	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
No	PR	TX	2	7	296	251	547	2.1	0.01	0.03	0.24	4.22
No	PR	UT	1	1	22	32	54	-1.4	0.05	0.03	1.48	0.68
No	PR	VA	4	18	745	1128	1873	1.1	0.01	0.02	0.33	3.00
No	PR	WA	1	0	72	113	185	-1.4	0.01	0.00	#DIV/0!	0.00
	Total		38	84	4041	5568	9609	0.9	0.01	0.02	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
No	SSBI	CA	0	20	51	1001	1052	2.0	0.00	0.02	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	SSBI	DC	0	0	27	250	277	0.0	0.00	0.00	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
No	SSBI	FL	2	13	35	337	372	-1.9	0.06	0.04	1.51	0.66
No	SSBI	IL	0	10	26	232	258	4.3	0.00	0.05	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	SSBI	MD	3	23	48	432	480	-0.9	0.07	0.06	1.19	0.84
No	SSBI	TX	0	15	74	234	308	6.4	0.00	0.07	0.00	#DIV/0!
No	SSBI	VA	2	34	82	729	811	2.2	0.03	0.05	0.51	1.96
	Total		7	115	343	3215	3558	1.7	0.02	0.04	0.53	1.83

Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
Yes	NACLC	AL	14	105	67	249	316	21.3	0.26	0.73	0.36	2.76
Yes	NACLC	AR	8	41	24	87	111	13.8	0.50	0.89	0.56	1.78
Yes	NACLC	AZ	24	108	65	274	339	2.5	0.59	0.65	0.90	1.11
Yes	NACLC	CA	42	280	186	1027	1213	4.7	0.29	0.37	0.78	1.29
Yes	NACLC	CO	13	99	50	196	246	24.5	0.35	1.02	0.34	2.90
Yes	NACLC	FL	38	109	122	300	422	5.2	0.45	0.57	0.79	1.26
Yes	NACLC	GA	22	190	80	384	464	22.0	0.38	0.98	0.39	2.58
Yes	NACLC	IL	22	96	46	203	249	-0.5	0.92	0.90	1.02	0.98
Yes	NACLC	IN	10	41	31	86	117	15.4	0.48	0.91	0.52	1.91
Yes	NACLC	KY	20	39	44	76	120	5.9	0.83	1.05	0.79	1.26
Yes	NACLC	LA	8	50	20	109	129	5.9	0.67	0.85	0.79	1.27
Yes	NACLC	MD	13	219	56	503	559	20.3	0.30	0.77	0.39	2.55
Yes	NACLC	MI	16	53	35	105	140	4.8	0.84	1.02	0.83	1.21
Yes	NACLC	MN	9	51	26	97	123	18.0	0.53	1.11	0.48	2.09
Yes	NACLC	MO	10	106	49	198	247	33.1	0.26	1.15	0.22	4.49
Yes	NACLC	NC	15	121	50	269	319	15.0	0.43	0.82	0.52	1.91
Yes	NACLC	NJ	6	73	31	177	208	21.9	0.24	0.70	0.34	2.92
Yes	NACLC	NM	7	29	25	59	84	21.2	0.39	0.97	0.40	2.49
Yes	NACLC	NY	13	54	39	163	202	-0.2	0.50	0.50	1.01	0.99
Yes	NACLC	OH	18	111	36	199	235	5.8	1.00	1.26	0.79	1.26
Yes	NACLC	OK	7	26	24	85	109	1.4	0.41	0.44	0.93	1.07
Yes	NACLC	OR	7	20	21	70	91	-4.8	0.50	0.40	1.25	0.80
Yes	NACLC	PA	20	111	60	254	314	10.4	0.50	0.78	0.64	1.55
Yes	NACLC	SC	6	54	28	150	178	14.6	0.27	0.56	0.48	2.06
Yes	NACLC	TN	7	39	33	126	159	9.7	0.27	0.45	0.60	1.67
Yes	NACLC	TX	80	337	172	782	954	-3.4	0.87	0.76	1.15	0.87
Yes	NACLC	VA	28	369	120	1062	1182	11.4	0.30	0.53	0.57	1.75
Yes	NACLC	WA	10	47	33	201	234	-6.9	0.43	0.31	1.42	0.70

Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
Yes	NACLC	WI	16	46	29	112	141	-14.1	1.23	0.70	1.77	0.57
			509	3024	1602	7603	9205	9.6			0.7	1.7
Yes	PR	VA	18	31	81	159	240	-2.7	0.29	0.24	1.18	0.85
Yes	PR	CA	6	12	47	86	133	1.2	0.15	0.16	0.90	1.11
Yes	PR	FL	4	12	28	53	81	8.4	0.17	0.29	0.57	1.76
Yes	PR	TX	5	12	32	35	67	18.7	0.19	0.52	0.35	2.82
Yes	PR	CO	3	9	23	23	46	26.1	0.15	0.64	0.23	4.29
Yes	PR	MD	3	20	37	60	97	25.2	0.09	0.50	0.18	5.67
			39	96	248	416	664	12.8			0.6	2.7
STATES WITH TOO FEW SUBJECTS INVESTIGATED BY AT LEAST ONE TYPE OF INVESTIGATOR FOR ANALYSIS												
No	NACLC	DE	0	12	14	100	114	12.0	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.00
No	NACLC	ID	0	5	18	63	81	7.9	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.00
No	NACLC	ME	1	2	7	42	49	-9.5	0.17	0.05	3.33	0.30
No	NACLC	MT	1	3	6	41	47	-9.3	0.20	0.08	2.53	0.39
No	NACLC	ND	0	8	12	84	96	9.5	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.00
No	NACLC	SD	3	11	15	71	86	-4.5	0.25	0.18	1.36	0.73
No	NACLC	UK	4	12	8	28	36	-7.1	1.00	0.75	1.33	0.75
No	NACLC	VT	0	0	7	20	27	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	NACLC	WY	0	1	10	59	69	1.7	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00
No	PR	AK	0	1	17	20	37	5.0	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00
No	PR	AR	0	0	18	4	22	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	CT	0	0	7	25	32	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	DE	0	0	13	12	25	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	IA	0	1	8	22	30	4.5	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00
No	PR	ID	0	1	10	8	18	12.5	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.00
No	PR	IN	0	0	19	18	37	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	ME	0	0	10	33	43	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	MI	1	0	19	26	45	-5.3	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00

Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
No	PR	MN	0	0	10	21	31	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	MT	0	0	3	12	15	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	NH	1	0	7	9	16	-14.3	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	NV	0	3	19	119	138	2.5	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00
No	PR	OR	1	0	7	8	15	-14.3	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	SD	1	0	13	3	16	-7.7	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	UK	1	0	3	1	4	-33.3	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	VT	0	0	1	2	3	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	WI	2	0	15	16	31	-13.3	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	WV	0	0	6	16	22	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	PR	WY	0	1	11	11	22	9.1	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	AK	0	1	3	23	26	4.3	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	AL	0	2	15	71	86	2.8	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	AR	0	2	2	15	17	13.3	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	AZ	0	7	13	156	169	4.5	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	CO	0	5	12	102	114	4.9	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	CT	0	5	5	37	42	13.5	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	DE	0	5	2	31	33	16.1	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	GA	2	6	14	70	84	-5.7	0.17	0.09	1.78	0.56
No	SSBI	HI	0	2	11	245	256	0.8	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	IA	0	8	1	115	116	7.0	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	ID	0	0	2	37	39	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	IN	0	9	2	83	85	10.8	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	KS	0	1	2	91	93	1.1	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	KY	0	2	7	67	74	3.0	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	LA	1	8	10	241	251	-6.7	0.11	0.03	3.24	0.31
No	SSBI	MA	0	0	4	51	55	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	ME	0	0	1	21	22	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	MI	0	4	5	119	124	3.4	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00

Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
No	SSBI	MN	0	2	3	36	39	5.6	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	MO	2	5	18	99	117	-6.1	0.13	0.05	2.35	0.43
No	SSBI	MS	0	0	12	66	78	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	MT	0	0	3	27	30	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	NC	1	13	19	130	149	4.7	0.06	0.11	0.50	2.00
No	SSBI	ND	0	1	1	39	40	2.6	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	NE	1	8	3	102	105	-25.5	0.50	0.09	5.88	0.17
No	SSBI	NH	0	1	3	20	23	5.0	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	NJ	0	4	15	83	98	4.8	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	NM	0	7	5	123	128	5.7	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	NV	1	3	5	87	92	-16.6	0.25	0.04	7.00	0.14
No	SSBI	NY	1	2	15	255	270	-5.9	0.07	0.01	9.04	0.11
No	SSBI	OH	0	9	19	140	159	6.4	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	OK	0	6	10	155	165	3.9	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	OR	0	0	1	29	30	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	PA	0	17	14	229	243	7.4	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	PR	0	1	1	49	50	2.0	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	RI	0	1	5	18	23	5.6	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	SC	1	3	17	57	74	-0.6	0.06	0.06	1.13	0.89
No	SSBI	SD	0	0	2	19	21	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	TN	0	4	6	120	126	3.3	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	UK	1	1	1	8	9	-87.5	0.00	0.14	0.00	204.08
No	SSBI	UT	0	1	4	52	56	1.9	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	VT	0	0	0	5	5	#DIV/0!	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	WA	1	1	14	176	190	-6.6	0.08	0.01	13.46	0.07
No	SSBI	WI	1	0	2	49	51	-50.0	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	WV	0	3	5	41	46	7.3	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.00
No	SSBI	WY	0	0	2	16	18	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	NACLC	AK	3	11	10	31	41	5.5	0.43	0.55	0.78	1.28

Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
Yes	NACLC	CT	0	7	9	53	62	13.2	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.00
Yes	NACLC	DC	1	10	12	106	118	1.1	0.09	0.10	0.87	1.15
Yes	NACLC	DE	2	12	4	24	28	0.0	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Yes	NACLC	HI	1	30	15	119	134	18.5	0.07	0.34	0.21	4.72
Yes	NACLC	IA	7	59	16	108	124	10.9	0.78	1.20	0.65	1.55
Yes	NACLC	ID	3	10	9	19	28	19.3	0.50	1.11	0.45	2.22
Yes	NACLC	KS	6	20	16	51	67	1.7	0.60	0.65	0.93	1.08
Yes	NACLC	MA	4	11	16	58	74	-6.0	0.33	0.23	1.42	0.70
Yes	NACLC	ME	2	5	6	16	22	-2.1	0.50	0.45	1.10	0.91
Yes	NACLC	MS	6	10	16	56	72	-19.6	0.60	0.22	2.76	0.36
Yes	NACLC	MT	0	8	4	27	31	29.6	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.00
Yes	NACLC	ND	1	9	6	29	35	14.4	0.20	0.45	0.44	2.25
Yes	NACLC	NE	3	26	5	50	55	-8.0	1.50	1.08	1.38	0.72
Yes	NACLC	NH	0	5	2	19	21	26.3	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00
Yes	NACLC	NV	2	14	11	64	75	3.7	0.22	0.28	0.79	1.26
Yes	NACLC	RI	0	3	4	13	17	23.1	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.00
Yes	NACLC	SD	1	22	4	37	41	34.5	0.33	1.47	0.23	4.40
Yes	NACLC	UK	18	17	19	33	52	-43.2	18.00	1.06	16.94	0.06
Yes	NACLC	UT	7	28	19	59	78	10.6	0.58	0.90	0.65	1.55
Yes	NACLC	VT	0	2	0	8	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.33	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	NACLC	WV	4	17	7	37	44	-11.2	1.33	0.85	1.57	0.64
Yes	NACLC	WY	1	5	4	22	26	-2.3	0.33	0.29	1.13	0.88
Yes	PR	AK	1	0	5	1	6	-20.0	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	AL	2	5	7	15	22	4.8	0.40	0.50	0.80	1.25
Yes	PR	AR	2	0	3	2	5	-66.7	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	AZ	4	3	23	18	41	-0.7	0.21	0.20	1.05	0.95
Yes	PR	CT	0	0	1	8	9	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	DC	2	0	16	58	74	-12.5	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	DE	0	0	1	2	3	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
Yes	PR	GA	3	2	17	14	31	-3.4	0.21	0.17	1.29	0.78
Yes	PR	HI	1	9	18	38	56	18.1	0.06	0.31	0.19	5.28
Yes	PR	IA	1	0	1	5	6	-100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	IL	0	1	8	8	16	12.5	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	IN	0	1	4	1	5	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	KS	0	0	2	8	10	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	KY	1	2	7	3	10	52.4	0.17	2.00	0.08	12.00
Yes	PR	LA	1	3	4	19	23	-9.2	0.33	0.19	1.78	0.56
Yes	PR	MA	0	0	4	4	8	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	ME	0	1	0	4	4	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.33	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	PR	MI	0	1	2	6	8	16.7	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	MN	0	0	3	5	8	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	MO	2	0	10	9	19	-20.0	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	MS	0	0	1	4	5	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	MT	0	0	2	0.0001	2	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	NC	4	5	19	15	34	12.3	0.27	0.50	0.53	1.88
Yes	PR	ND	0	0	4	3	7	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	NE	3	2	10	9	19	-7.8	0.43	0.29	1.50	0.67
Yes	PR	NH	1	0	2	0.0001	2	-50.0	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	NJ	0	3	4	5	9	60.0	0.00	1.50	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	NM	0	0	7	11	18	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	NV	2	6	2	18	20	-66.7	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	NY	2	1	8	15	23	-18.3	0.33	0.07	4.67	0.21
Yes	PR	OH	0	1	6	5	11	20.0	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	OK	0	1	1	7	8	14.3	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	OR	0	0	0	1	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	PA	1	1	8	9	17	-1.4	0.14	0.13	1.14	0.88
Yes	PR	RI	0	0	2	2	4	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	SC	1	1	9	5	14	8.9	0.13	0.25	0.50	2.00

Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
Yes	PR	SD	0	0	2	1	3	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	TN	2	2	6	9	15	-11.1	0.50	0.29	1.75	0.57
Yes	PR	UK	0	1	0	1	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	UT	1	2	4	5	9	15.0	0.33	0.67	0.50	2.00
Yes	PR	WA	0	5	14	22	36	22.7	0.00	0.29	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	WI	1	0	1	2	3	-100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	WV	0	0	0	1	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	PR	WY	0	0	1	1	2	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	AK	0	2	0	5	5	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.67	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	AL	0	9	1	22	23	40.9	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	AR	1	3	1	7	8	-57.1	0.00	0.75	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	AZ	1	11	2	44	46	-25.0	1.00	0.33	3.00	0.33
Yes	SSBI	CA	1	44	8	231	239	6.5	0.14	0.24	0.61	1.65
Yes	SSBI	CO	2	13	2	28	30	-53.6	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	CT	0	2	0	10	10	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.25	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	DC	0	8	5	38	43	21.1	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	DE	0	1	0	3	3	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.50	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	FL	1	34	3	102	105	0.0	0.50	0.50	1.00	1.00
Yes	SSBI	GA	0	20	2	47	49	42.6	0.00	0.74	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	HI	0	5	1	55	56	9.1	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	IA	0	19	0	35	35	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	1.19	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	ID	0	2	0	6	6	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.50	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	IL	1	9	2	46	48	-30.4	1.00	0.24	4.11	0.24
Yes	SSBI	IN	0	5	0	12	12	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.71	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	KS	0	3	0	13	13	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.30	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	KY	0	11	1	29	30	37.9	0.00	0.61	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	LA	0	18	1	57	58	31.6	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	MA	0	2	0	14	14	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.17	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	MD	2	53	6	115	121	12.8	0.50	0.85	0.58	1.71



Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
Yes	SSBI	ME	0	1	0	4	4	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.33	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	MI	0	12	0	26	26	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.86	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	MN	0	10	0	20	26	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	1.00	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	MO	1	6	3	14	17	9.5	0.50	0.75	0.67	1.50
Yes	SSBI	MS	0	0	2	11	13	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	MT	0	2	0	3	3	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	2.00	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	NC	1	15	3	34	37	10.8	0.50	0.79	0.63	1.58
Yes	SSBI	ND	0	1	0	8	8	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.14	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	NE	0	18	0	43	43	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.72	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	NH	0	4	0	20	20	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.25	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	NM	0	7	0	19	19	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.58	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	NV	0	5	1	20	21	25.0	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	NY	0	10	0	32	32	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.45	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	OH	1	15	3	28	31	20.2	0.50	1.15	0.43	2.31
Yes	SSBI	OK	0	3	0	33	33	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.10	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	OR	0	4	0	17	17	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.31	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	PA	0	11	2	29	31	37.9	0.00	0.61	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	PR	0	0	0	4	4	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	RI	0	0	0	4	4	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	SC	0	14	0	26	26	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	1.17	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	SD	0	6	0	13	13	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.86	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	TN	0	5	0	30	30	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.20	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	TX	0	33	6	75	81	44.0	0.00	0.79	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	UK	0	6	1	9	10	66.7	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	UT	0	2	0	11	11	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.22	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	VA	6	75	15	189	204	-0.3	0.67	0.66	1.01	0.99
Yes	SSBI	VT	0	1	0	1	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.00	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	WA	0	12	2	45	47	26.7	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00
Yes	SSBI	WI	0	6	0	16	16	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.60	#DIV/0!	0.00

Self Report	Type of Investigation	State	Total # of Subjects Contractors Find	Total # of Subjects Federal Agents Find	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Contractors	Total # of Subjects Investigated by Fed Agents	Total # of Subjects Overall	Percentage Point Difference: Feds – Contractor	Odds Contractor Find S w/Record	Odds Federal Agent Finds S w/Record	Odds Ratio If Conducted by Contractor	Odds Ratio if Conducted by Federal Agent
Yes	SSBI	WV	0	1	0	6	6	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.20	#DIV/0!	0.00
Yes	SSBI	WY	0	1	0	6	6	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.20	#DIV/0!	0.00